

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成26年度
(第18号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2014

Volume XVIII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2015・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2015

A new Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* (Texts from the Split Collection 3)

Harry FALK

The manuscript presented here belongs to the so-called “Split collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts”, encountered by the author in the bazaar of Peshawar. Its origins are not fully clear, at least the find site is said to be Bajaur or its close vicinity in the tribal area of north-western Pakistan. Because the owners still hold more mss of the find, with some others already gone to different customers, the collection has been labeled “Split” to allow maintaining the term once other parts will come to light, irrespective of their places of accommodation. Two of the five manuscripts have been published so far. One is a single segment from a birch-bark sheet containing a few stanzas of the Aṭṭhakavagga of the Suttanipāṭa (Falk 2011: 13-15), the second ms contains parts of the text of a Prajñāpāramitā, a forerunner of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā (Falk & Karashima 2012, 2013). The third text is presented here.

The ms consists of one single sheet of birch-bark, inscribed on only one side. The sheet once measured about 14 × 54 cm.¹ It broke into 11 larger segments along the lateral folds when it was rolled up and the roll flattened. The first two segments, once on the outside on top and bottom of the roll, lost material amounting to at least 2 full lines of the running text, one on each lateral fold respectively. The segments from the flattened roll show diagonal abrasions on one side, proof that it was used as an implement to wipe, or brush, something for a period of time. This process has erased a minimum of 4 *akṣaras* at the tip of the diagonal abrasion and about 15 at its base. A similar slanting abrasion is found on the birch-bark of the Prajñāpāramitā,² although much less pronounced. The segments and some fragments have been electronically rearranged (plates 4–6), showing the position in the two glass frames on the left and the running line numbers on the right.

This edition adds yet another version to the already impressive collection of texts usually called Dharmapada (Dhp). Few of them contain this term in their title, the most substantially preserved group of Sanskrit mss calls their contents *udāna* or *udānavarga*. The Pali Dhammapada is preserved in manuscripts which differ not very much among themselves. All other versions in Prakrit or Sanskrit are interlinked on account of a series of stanzas they have in common and occurring in the same sequence, or by particular phrases unique to two or more of them. On the whole there are often more differences than common traits when comparing any pair of versions.

¹. For a comparison with other birch-barks of this collection cf. Falk & Strauch 2014: 75.

². Falk & Karashima 2013 pl. 53, right side.

Our text again presents a collection which is basically independent of other versions. With very few exceptions all stanzas found in it are either known from other Dhp versions or occur in texts from the Pali canon. Since most stanzas do not present breathtaking philosophical insights the value of one more collection may be regarded as limited. However, this new collection is important as it is the third Dhp written in the Kharoṣṭhī script of the North-West published so far. The first was the legendary “Gāndhārī Dharmapada” presented with meticulous commentaries by J. Brough in 1962. The birch-bark segments were most likely found near Khotan, at the south-western end of the Taklamakan desert. Its language and find-place explain the abbreviation used in Lenz (2003) and here, “Dhp-G^K”. Fragments of a second manuscript in Kharoṣṭhī script from the British Library in London were published by Lenz (2003; Dhp-G^L). Nothing much of it survived the ravages of time and thus this ms mainly demonstrates that another version existed. Our ms is labeled Dhp-G^S because of its being part of the “Split” collection. It is in comparison rather voluminous, presenting 90 stanzas or parts of them on one sheet of birch-bark and it seems as if the ms is more or less complete, although not undamaged. There is not a single stanza with a parallel in Lenz’ edition, but 39 stanzas have parallels in the collection from Khotan. This local aspect is the most interesting one as we now are able to compare stanzas written in the same script, not very much removed in time from each other, but certainly composed in different areas. We are used to call the language of the Khotan Dhp “Gāndhārī”, but when we now compare a version which really comes from Gandhara, we see that there are differences of a systematic kind, which may force us to re-christen the language of the Khotan Dhp “Central-Asian Gāndhārī”, which sounds like a *contradictio in adiecto* but we also have “American English” and are used to living with it, – and expect that it is different from English proper.

School affiliation

In general I share the opinion of Boucher (2005: 293f.) that searching for a school affiliation of a given Buddhist text is often coupled with too much hope in the expected answers. Even doctrinal texts ran through a “crucial but poorly documented pre- and para-sectarian, transitional phase when significant doctrinal issues were emerging and the Buddhist exegetical genre was still a work in progress”, as Cox (2013: 61b) said with early Kharoṣṭhī mss in view. Non-doctrinal texts like the Dhp were, basically, fair game and were dependent on personal preferences more than on anything else. Political upheavals and plagues may have co-mingled the survivors of diverse “schools”, which will have led to a mixture of texts and ideas as well. We have no means to reconstruct such re-unions.³ Without doctrinal implications and meant for the interaction with lay people a new version of the Dhp needed no sanctioning by a dominant local group, be it hereditary or newly installed.

According to the preface of the Fa ju jing (法句經 T. 224 CE; Lévi 1912: 218), the following five schools produced their own *dharmapada* collection, the Dharmaguptakas, the Sarvastivādins, the Kāśyapīyas, the Mahīśāsakas and the Vātsīputrīyas. However,

³ In contrast, the stages of growth of the texts can be reconstructed sometimes, either by inner criteria (Pali Udāna, Analayo 2009) or by reports of the compilers themselves (Willems 1973).

even the early Chinese quotations from unaffiliated Dharmapadas show that there must have existed more Dhps from other schools or many versions within the individual schools (Mizuno 1979).

The Pali Dhammapada (Dhp) belongs to the Theravādins, as is self-evident. It is quoted following the edition of von Hinüber & Norman (1994). The Udānavarga (Uv) was preserved at different sites in East Turkestan and was collated by Bernhard (1965). It has different layers on a general scale (Schmithausen 1970),⁴ and numerous sub-versions (Bernhard 1965,I: 14), the oldest parts belonging to Sarvastivāda communities, the latter included the Mūlasarvāstivādins. To the Sarvāstivādins too belongs the Uv from Subāši on the northern Silk Road in Xinjiang, cited here from the edition of Nakatani (1987). It is different from Bernhard's edition in many passages and in many ways. The Mahāvastu (Mvu) is a text of the Mahāsaṅghikas, which preserves mostly parts of the *sahasravarga*, with some stray links to our text. The Patna-Dharmapada (Dhp-P, cited from Cone 1989) is most likely to have been connected with the Sammatīyas (Namikawa 1993, Skilling 1997a). The Dharmapada from Khotan (Dhp-G^K) was edited by J. Brough (1962), who had no real argument in favour of any of the schools known in the area, and who excluded the Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsaṅghikas only because they are linked with other known Dhp versions. From the epigraphically attested *nikāyas* active in Gandhara only the Dharmaguptakas and the Kāśyapīyas remained and so he considered one of them the most likely candidate for shaping the Dhp-G^K (Brough 1962: 45). His reasoning as well as the additional versions available today would not exclude any other choice instead. The evidence for assigning the fragments from the British Library including the Dhp to the Dharmaguptakas is much better (Lenz 2003: xiii). A short quotation from their Dhp in Tibetan translation found in the work of Bhāvya, 6th century, pertains to the Dīpaṃkara (Skilling 1997b: 609), a truly indigenous topic to the area where the British Library fragments are said to have been found.

Brough (1962: 43) expected his Dhp-G^K to be a fixed version inside a certain sectarian canon. The number of versions accruing presently⁵ seem to contradict such a canonical exclusivity and we must be content with pointing at possibilities. For our text I see only one real argument, arising from our stanza 2,10, which starts *///gahe budho*, which has a parallel in *prāpto rājagṛhe buddho* in the Catuspariṣatsūtra (Waldschmidt 1962: 394 no. 3). The other parallels (Pali Vinaya, Mahāvastu) read differently. In the latest *pāda* of this stanza Vin and Mvu use the third person (*nayissati*, *nayiṣyati*), while the CPS uses the second (*nayiṣyatha*). In our text an original *naeśati* was overwritten with a *sa* to produce the second person *naeśasi*. The Catuspariṣatsūtra belongs to the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who separated after the time of our ms from and finally reunited with the Sarvāstivādins. And so our ms could have its origins in Sarvāstivāda circles. I would not call it “the Gāndhārī Dharmapada of the Sarvāstivādins”, but would also not exclude the possibility that it is one of probably dozens of versions composed by monks with links to the Sarvāstivādins. In any case, such an affiliation would explain the many

⁴. None of the Uv verses Schmithausen found in the Yogācārabhūmi have parallels in the Dhp-G^S.

⁵. One more ms containing verses of a Dhp on its topmost segment was seen 4 years ago by the author with a dealer in Islamabad.

verbal similarities between the Dhp-G^S and the Uv.

If all the Split Collection mss come from the same monastery, as seems likely, we can try to accumulate evidence from all its texts known so far. The single and still unedited Avadāna ms separates narratives by the phrase “NN *avadana jāpati*” (Falk 2011: 19). The verb is *jāpati* in Sanskrit. Karashima (2012, III: 560) has shown that the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins use this verb to simply express “to speak, utter”. The Mahāsāṅghikas are attested epigraphically in Wardak, west of Kabul, and also in the Peshawar valley, although sparingly, according to the number of just two inscriptions. The parallels from the Mahāvastu belong to this *nikāya*, they have, however, very little in common with our text, so that the evidence of *jāpati* is either arbitrary or a possibly closer connection between the Dhp-G^S and the Mvu has disappeared in the course of the many centuries involved.

The sequence of stanzas

Clearly related versions usually show a similar sequence of stanzas. A sequence of three stanzas following each other in the same order may be regarded as non-arbitrary. I have marked such sequences in the table below in bold. It can be clearly seen that in the versions published so far there are great differences.

The first two *vargas* of this new version have been labeled *śīlavarga* and *prakīrṇakavarga* on the basis of the parallels simply for easier reference. Both draw their material from all directions without a clear topic uniting these two groups. In these makeshift collections no single triple group is found. In the *jarāvarga* the Uv presents one sequence at least. In the *malavarga* it is the Pali Dhp and the Dhp-P, with the latter showing even a parallelism over four stanzas in one case. In the *puṣpavarga* it is Dhp-G^K, Dhp and Subaśi which show a concordance, with Dhp-G^K having two strings of three stanzas each in common with Dhp-G^S, while Subaśi has even one sequence of four.

When comparing the Chinese versions as found in Willemen 1973 a similar picture arises. There is no exclusive similarity with the two versions with links to the Theravādins,⁶ the Fa ju jing (法句經, T.210; Willemen 1973: 204f.; Faucett 1968) and the Fa ju pi yu jing (法句譬喻經, T.211; Willemen 1973: 205-213), dating as early as 224 and 290-306 CE. In 11 cases these two Chinese texts plus the Pali Dhp have no corresponding text to the Uv, while our text as well as the two Sarvāstivāda texts, the Chu yao jing (出曜經, T.212; Willemen 1973: 214-215) from 399 CE and the Fa ji yao song jing (法集要頌經, T.213) from 985 CE, do have. A mixture of Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda sources seems to become apparent through 10 cases, given the observation that only the old Fa ju jing (法句經, T.210) from 224 CE and all the Sarvāstivāda texts plus ours, go against the Pali and the second Chinese text with links to the Theravadins.

On the other hand we have our stanzas 4,1-3, which have no counterpart in the Uv and the two Sarvāstivāda translations, but are found in the Dhp 241-243, in the Dhp-P and in both Chinese Theravāda sources (Willemen 1974: 51).

This picture allows no clear statement as to which other collection this new one is related. It has some relations to all of them, with the Uv having the greatest number of

⁶ On account of the closeness to the Pali version and because of some linguistic particularities, Dhammajoti (2009) opts for an intermediate version from the North-West, possibly attributable to the Mahīśāsakas.

parallels as such, although in different sequences and in different *vargas*. This picture resembles the one gained by Yamazaki (2000) who assembled all parallels starting from the Pali Dhp, or the tables in Bernhard (1968), or the parallels in Willemen (1974), both starting from the Uv.

List of parallels

The two Dharmapadas in Gāndhārī come first, followed by the Pali Dhp and the Patna Dhp, then the two Udānavargas and finally stanzas from the Pali canon and other sources, some of them for the first time part of a Dhp:

Dhp-G ^s	Dhp-G ^k	Dhp	Dhp-P	Uv	Subaṣi	others
*śīlavarga:						
1,1=1		274	360	12,11		
1,2=2	323	303	331	10,8	115	
1,3=3						AN IV 5-7
1,4=4						AN IV 5-6
1,5=5			341			ThG 509
1,6=6				6,1		
1,7=7				6,8+4,30		
1,8=8				6,6		
1,9=9				6,7+31,44		AN II 40
1,10=10	329	320	215	29,21		
1,11=11		170	258	27,15/16		
*prakīrṇavarga:						
2,1=12		97	333	29,23		
2,2=13	260		330			
2,3=14	228			25,1		ThG 1018
2,4=15	229			25,2		ThG 1019
2,5=16		249	327	10,12		
2,6=17						ThG 246
2,7=18				10,14	118	Ja V 233
2,8=19						(no parallels found)
2,9=20						(destroyed)
2,10=21				21,5		Vin I 8; MN I 171; CPS II no. 8; Mvu III 326
2,11=22						Vin I 43; CPS III 394; Mvu III 90
2,12=23	267			21,8		Vin I 43; SN I 127f.; Mvu III 90
2,13=24			213			Vin II 195; Ja V 336
2,14=25						ThiG 161
2,15=26	256			22,2		ThG 276
2,16=27	259	305	313	23,2	297	
2,17=28		304		29,19		

Dhp-G^s	Dhp-G^k	Dhp	Dhp-P	Uv	Subaši	others
*jarāvarga:						
3,1=29	139	156	230	17,4		
3,2=30	160	151		1,28		
3,3=31	140			1,29		SN V 217
3,4=32				1,30		SN V 217
3,5=33			260	1,27		ThG 73; Ja I 139
3,6=34	142	148	259	1,34		
3,7=35			78	29,14		SN I 81f.
3,8=36	161	348	150	29,57		
3,9=37	159					ThG 32
3,10=38						SN I 2; AN I 155
3,11=39						SN I 2; AN I 155
3,12=40						SN I 3
3,13=41						SN I 3
3,14=42				1,18		
3,15=43		136		9,12		
3,16=44	151			1,7		Ja IV 127 = VI 28 vs. 118
3,17=45	152			1,8		Ja VI 26, vs. 100
3,18=46	147			1,11		Sn 579
3,19=47	146			1,10		Ja VI 572 vs. 2325
3,20=48				1,23		SN I 97
3,21=49				5,22		SN I 97
3,22=50				5,23		
3,23=51				5,7		(vague similarity)
3,24=52				29,22		
3,25=53			120			
3,26=54	145			1,33		Ja VI 26, vs. 101
						Mbh 13, app.15, 4062f.+
3,27=55	144			1,6		Ja IV 494
3,28=56				1,31		
3,29=57				1,42		It 40f.
*malavarga:						
4,1=58		241	157			
4,2=59		242	158			
4,3=60		243	159			
4,4=61		240	160	9,19		Nett 129
4,5=62		239	163	2,10		
4,6=63		235	161			
4,7=64		236	162	16,3		
4,8=65						SN I 32
4,9=66						SN I 137
4,10=67		339	237	31,29		
4,11=68						SN I 98; It 45
4,12=69	2	394		33,6		

Dhp-G ^s	Dhp-G ^K	Dhp	Dhp-P	Uv	Subaši	others
*puṣpavarga						
5,1=70	290	51	125	18,6		ThG 323
5,2=71	291	52	126		222f.	ThG 324
5,3=72	293	53	130	18,10		
5,4=73	292	49	127	18,8	224	
5,5=74	271	50	309	18,9	225	
5,6=75	303	58	135	18,12	226	
5,7=76	304	59	136	18,13	227	
5,8=77	295	54	121	6,16		
5,9=78	296	55	122	6,17		
5,10=79	297	57	124	6,19		
5,11=80	294	47	128	18,14		
5,12=81		48	129	18,15		
5,13=82	300	46	134	18,18		
5,14=83	301	44	131	18,1		
5,15=84	302	45			218	
*sahasravarga						
6,1=85	306	100	376			Mvu III 434
6,2=86				24,2		
6,3=87	308					Mvu III 434
6,4=88	305	103		13,3	298	Mvu III 434
6,5=89		104	319	23,4		
6,6=90	319-20	107	380	24,16		Mvu III 435

The text

The present text enlarges our possibilities to compare structure, contents, vocabulary and phonology of the various Dhps. In order to facilitate comparative studies, the running text is given in the left column in bold characters, with line numbers in brackets. Defect but recognizable letters are given in square brackets, missing consonants or vowel strokes are marked by a middle dot “.”, completely missing characters are shown as “+” and partly preserved, but illegible ones as “..”. The numerous spaces are represented by underlines of various length, following the original. In a number of cases they help to define the metre. Corrections by overwriting are shown as “(original letter → resulting letter)”. The numbering is double, first according to *vargas*, then also continuously. The major parallels follow in the right column. The sequence is Dhp-G^K, Dhp or other Pali sources, Dhp-P and Uv with the Uv from Subaši. Some remarks on the palaeography and remarks on the writing process close this edition.

(1:)

+ + + + + + +

(2:) + + + + + + +

+ + + + + + +

[e]ṣa marasa mohaṇo [*1,1]

ṣadho śīleṇa sampaṇa

yaśa bhoga sama[p.] +

(3:) + + + + + + +

+ + + + + yida [*1,2]

io (+ 3 letters *ajihi* wiped out)

aṇutridiya ajihima katava

ṣa[dha]dhaṇa śi + + +

+ + + + (4:) + + + +

+ + + + + + +

+ ña e satamo dhaṇa ___ [*1,3]

es' eva maggo n' atth' añño

dassanassa visuddhiyā,

etaṃ hi tumhe paṭipajjatha

mārass' etaṃ pamohanam. Dhp 274

eseva māggo nāstaṃ'ño

daṃśanassa viśuddhiye,

taṃ māggaṃ paṭipajjahvo

mārasse 'sā pramohanī,

etāhi tubbhe paṭipannā

dukkhassa antaṃ kariṣyatha. Dhp-P 360

eṣo hi mārgo nāsty anyo

darśanasya viśuddhaye,

pratipannakāḥ prahāsyanti

dhyāyino mārabandhanam. Uv 12,11

ṣadhu śīleṇa sabaṇo

yaśa-bho'a-samapidu,

yeṇa yeṇeva vayadi

teṇa teṇeva puyidu. Dhp-G^K 323

saddho sīlena sampanno

yasobhogasamappito,

yaṃ yaṃ padesaṃ bhajati

tattha tatth' eva pūjito. Dhp 303

śrāddhaḥ śīlena sampannas

tyāgavāṃ vītamatsaraḥ,

vrajate yatra yatraiva

tatra tatraiva pūjyate. Uv 10,8

śraddho śīlena sampanno

yaśabhogasamāhito,

yaṃ yaṃ so bhajate deśaṃ

tattha tattheva pūjiyo. Dhp-P 331

yena yena v(ra)jati

tat(ra) tat(r)aiva p(ū)j(yat)e. Subaṣi 115c+d

[cf. p. 59 on the writing process]

saddhāddhanam sīladhanam

hiri ottappiyaṃ dhanam

sutadhanam ca cāgo ca

paññā ve sattamaṃ dhanam. AN IV 5-7

yas ed(e) dhaṇa ya (a→da)ṇi⁷

istriya puruṣa ++

++++++

(5:) sa jivido [*1,4]

tasva śadha ca śīla ca

prasada dhamadeśaṇe __

aṇuyujea mesa +

++++++ [*1,5]

(6:) śīlo rakṣeya meṣavo

prathea ṇa trae suhaṃ

praśaṃśo vi(dra→tra)labha ca

preca svargeṣu ma ° [*1,6]

+++++ (7:) praṇo

cita praṇa ca bhavae

pravuṇi⁹ aṇ(u)pruveṇa

sarvasaṃyojanakṣayo [*1,7]

śi[1·] +++++

+++++ (8:) (s)aṃ[v]udo

bhoyaṇasvayamatraṃṇa __

jagariaṇuyujido __ [*1,8]

eva vihari adavi

.. +++++

++++++

(9:) yovekṣema[sa]¹⁰ p[r]atiyo [*1,9]

yassa ete dhanā atthi

itthiyā purisassa vā

adāliddo ti taṃ āhu

amoghaṃ tassa jivitaṃ.⁸ AN IV 5-6

tasmā saddhaṇ ca śīlaṇ ca

pasādaṃ dhammadassanaṃ,

anuyuñjetha medhāvī

saraṃ buddhāna sāsanaṃ. ThG 509

tassā śraddhaṇ ca śīlaṃ ca

prasādaṃ dhammadaṃśane,

anuyuñjeya medhāvī

saraṃ buddhāna śāsanaṃ. DhP-P 341

śīlaṃ rakṣeta medhāvī

prārthayaṃ vai sukhatrayam,

praśaṃsā vittalābhaṃ ca

pretya svarge ca modanam. Uv 6,1

śīle pratiṣṭhito bhikṣuś

cittaṃ prajñāṃ ca bhāvayet,

ātāpī nipako nityaṃ

prāpnuyād duḥkhasaṃkṣayaṃ. Uv 6,8

apramādarato bhikṣuḥ

pramāde bhayadarśakaḥ,

spṛśati hy anupūrveṇa

sarvasaṃyojanakṣayam. Uv 4,30

śīle pratiṣṭhito bhikṣur

indriyaiś ca saṃvṛtaḥ,

bhojane cāpi mātrajño

yukto jāgarikāsu ca. Uv 6,6

evaṃ vihāri ātāpī

ahorattam atandito,

bhāvayaṃ kusalaṃ dhammaṃ

yogakkhemassa pattiya. AN II 40 Burmese ms

viharann evaṃ ātāpī

⁷ The scribe seems first to have copied a misshaped *athi* or *asti* as *ani*, which he then changed into *dani*, Skt *idāni*, to make it give sense.

⁸ For the pādas c+d) the AN shows two variants, *adāliddo* etc. on pages 5 to 6, and *sa ve mahaddhano loke ajeyyo devamānuse* on page 7. None of the variants can account for the traces seen on the right side of line 5, where two or three letters seem to stand alone with wide margins to the left and right.

⁹ For *pravuṇi* cf. s.v. *anuprāpuni* in Edgerton, BHS dictionary: 205, an aorist used as optative. The stanza is split in two in the Uv.

¹⁰ The *ve* in *yovekṣema* is most likely to be explained as a misread *ga*. For the reverse process, i.e. misreading *ye* for *gra* (in *gramatakhtua* for *yematakhtua*) cf. Falk 2009: 111. In the Uv the single stanza was again divided into two.

ahu nago va sakrame

cavativadida [śara

ativa] .. + + + + + + + + + + (10:) + +

+ + + + + + [śil·h·] + + + +¹² [*1,10]

+ + + + + + +

+ + + + + + +

+ + + + + + +

(11:) mucuraya no paśati [*1,11]

10-1 °

aśadho agidaṃṇo [ya]

.. dh]iched(o) ca yo nara

hy ahorātram atandritaḥ,
abhavyaḥ parihāṇāya
nirvāṇasyaiva so 'ntike. Uv 6,7

yo hy udagreṇa cittena
tv adīnena sadā naraḥ,
bhāvayet kuśalāṃ dharmāṃ
yogakṣemasya prāptaye. Uv, 31,44

aho nako va sagami
cavadhivadida¹¹ śara
adivaka tiḍḍikṣami
druśilo hi baho-jaṇo. Dhp-G^K 329

ahaṃ nāgo va saṅgāme
cāpāto patitaṃ saraṃ,
ativākyam titikkhissaṃ
dussilo hi bahujjano. Dhp 320

ahaṃ nāgo va saṃgrāme
cāpātīpatite śare,
ativāde titikkhāmi
duśśilo hi bahujano. Dhp-P 215

ahaṃ nāga iva saṃgrāme
cāpād utpatitāṃ śarān,
ativākyam titikṣāmi
duḥśilo hi mahājanaḥ. Uv 29,21

yathā bubbulakaṃ passe
yathā passe marīcikaṃ,
evaṃ lokaṃ avekkhantaṃ
maccurājā na passati. Dhp 170

yathā budbudikāṃ paśyed
yatha paśyen marīcikāṃ,
evaṃ lokaṃ (16: kāyam) avekṣaṃ vai
mṛtyurājāṃ na paśyati. Uv 27,15 or 16

yathā bubbudakaṃ paśśe
yathā paśśe marīcikaṃ,
evaṃ lokam aveccāṇaṃ
maccurājā na paśśati. Dhp-P 258

[11 stanzas of the *śīlavarga completed.]

assaddho akataññū ca
sandhicchedo ca yo nara,

^{11.} c: on *cāpa-atipātītān cf. Brough (1962: 273), Norman (1997: 138); our text does away with the stray *adhi*°.

^{12.} The distribution of space used is unclear.

hada[vavagaś]o + + + ¹³

+ + + + + + + [*2,1 = 12]

(12:) + + + + + + +

+ ____ [k·va]la

so hi maadhano logo °

mahamamñida ya .. + [*2,2 = 13]¹⁴

+ + + + + + +

(13:) + + + + + + +

[sakha na ka]reda paḍido _

saṃgadi kavuruṣehi paviyo _ [*2,3 = 14]

śadhehi ca [p]· + + + + +

(14:) + + + + + + + + + +

+ kha kurveya paḍi _

saṃgati saṃpuruṣehi bhadiya _ [*2,4 = 15]

hatāvakāso vantāso

sa ve uttamaporiso. Dhp 97

aśraddho akataṃñū ca

saṃdhicchedo ca yo naro,

hatāvakāso vāntāso

sa ve uttimaporuṣo. Dhp-P 333

aśraddhaś cākṛtajñāś ca

saṃdhicchettā ca yo naraḥ,

hatāvakāso vāntāśaḥ

sa vai tūttamapūruśaḥ. Uv 29,23

yasa śadha i prañā ya

viya otrapi'a hiri,

so ho maha-dhaṇa bhodi

mohaṃ aña baho dhana. Dhp-G^K 260

yo dṛiṣṭe dhamme labhati

śraddhaṃ praṃñāṃ anuttarāṃ,

sa ve mahaddhano loke

mohaṃ aṃñāṃ bahuṃ dhanāṃ. Dhp-P 330

aśadhehi kradavehi

phiśuṇehi vivhuda-nanahi,

sakha na kari'a paṇido

sagadi kavuruṣehi paviya. Dhp-G^K 228

pisunena ca kodhanena

maccharinā ca vibhūtinandinā,

sakhitaṃ na kareyya paṇḍito

pāpo kāpurisena saṃgamo. ThG 1018

aśraddhebbhiḥ kadaryebhiḥ

piśunair vibhūtinandibhiḥ,

sākhyaṃ kurvīta na prajñāḥ

saṃgatiḥ pāpair hi pāpikā. Uv 25,1

śadhehi ya peśalehi ya

śilavada yi bahoṣudehi ya,

sakha kuvi'a paṇido

sagadi saṃpuruṣehi bhadi'a. Dhp-G^K 229

¹³. For *vavagaśo* cf. the similar dittography in *kujararo* (*kuñjaraḥ*) Dhp-G^S 2,12. For the stanza cf. Hara 1992.

¹⁴. This stanza has no clear parallel. The pādas a+b) in the Dhp-P can be compared to Uv 10,9ab and pādas c+d) are similar to Dhp-G^K 260 and Dhp-P 330, but the end of pāda b) in Dhp-G^S has no counterpart anywhere. Pāda d) shares the first four consonants with Dhp-G^K 260 when spoken, and with Dhp-P also in writing, so that a faulty reconstruction in Dhp-G^S seems at least possible, changing *mohaṃ anyam* to *mahaṃ* (Pkt; Skt *mahantaṃ*) *manye(ta)*. A “reconstruction” in the course of oral transmission would account for the differences.

dadanti [hi] + + + +
 + + + + + + + +
 (15:) + + + + + + + +
 + + + + .. bh·yano
 na so divo va radi va
 samasiṃ asigachati ____ [*2,5 = 16]

.. + + + + + + + +
 (16:) + + + + + + + +
 + + + + + + + +
 + [sti ducari]do mamō ____ [*2,6 = 17]

vigadaṣadha na sevea
udavaṇaṃ + + + +
 (17:) + + + + + + + +
 + + + + + + + + [*2,7 = 18]

saddhena ca pesalena ca
 paññavatā bahussutena ca,
 sakhiṭaṃ hi kareyya paṇḍito
 bhaddo sappurisenā saṃgamo. ThG 1019

śrāddhebbhiḥ peśalebhiś ca
śīlavadbhir bahuśrutaiḥ,
sākhyam kurvīta saprajñāḥ
saṃgatir bhadrair hi bhadrikā. Uv 25,2

dadanti¹⁵ ve yathāsaddhaṃ
 yathāpasādanam jāno,
 tattha yo maṅku bhavati
 paresaṃ pānabhojane
 na so divā vā rattiṃ vā
 samādhim adhigacchati. Dhp 249

dadanti eke yathā śraddhā
 yathāvibhavato janāḥ,
 tatra yo durmanā bhavati
 pareṣāṃ pānabhojane,
 nāsau divā ca ratrau ca
 samādhim adhigacchati. Uv 10,12

dadanti ve yathāśraddhaṃ
 yathāprasadanam janā,
 tathā yo duṃmano hoti
 paresaṃ pānabhojane,
 na so divā ca rāto ca
 samādhim adhigacchati. Dhp-P 327

ahu tuyhaṃ pure saddhā
 sā te ajja na vijjati,
 yaṃ tuyhaṃ tuyham ev' etaṃ
 n' atthi ducaritaṃ mama. ThG 246

vītasaddhaṃ na seveyya
 udapānaṃ v' anodakaṃ,
 sace pi naṃ anukhaṇe
 vāri kaddamagandhikaṃ. Ja V *233

vītaśraddhaṃ na seveta
 hradam yadvaddhi nirjalam,
 sa cet khanel labhet tatra
 vāri kardamagandhikam. Uv 10,14

... naḥ parikhaned
 vāri karddamagandhika. Subaśi 118c+d,

¹⁵. On *dadāti* vs. *dadanti* in Dhp a) cf. Norman 1997: 121.

++ ·a·a dhrua ṣadha
 idi driṭho maya pure _
 yasa driṭho [tasa s·] .. _
 + + + + (18:) + + + + [*2,8 = 19]¹⁶

+ + + + + + +
 + + + + + [d·v·]
 [m· .. y·t·v·v·s· ..
 + .. + + + + +
 (19:) + + + + + + +
 .. + + + + + + [*2,9 = 20]¹⁷

+ .. [śa v· jina bh·t·]
 [y· prata asava]kṣayo
 jida me pavaga dhama
 tasva hu uvaga [*2,10 = 21]

+ + + + (20:) gahe budho
 magasaṇa giri[v]raṇu¹⁹
 sarva saṃjaia netva __
 ka sa daṇi naeśasi [*2,11 = 22]

*. . . dhruvaṃ śrāddhaṃ
 *idaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ mayā purā
 *yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā?? . . .

mādisā ve jinā honti
 ye pattā āsavakkhayaṃ,
 jītā me pāpakā dhammā
 tasmā' haṃ upakā jino. Vin I 8, MN I 171

jinā hi māḍṣā bhonti
 ye prāptā āsavaṃkṣayaṃ,
 jītā me pāpakā dharmā
 tasmād ahaṃ upaka jino. Mvu III 326: 19f.

jinā hi māḍṣā jñeyā
 ye prāptā hy āsavaṃkṣayaṃ,
 jītā me pāpakā dharmās
 tato 'haṃ upagā jinaḥ. Uv 21,5¹⁸

agato kho mahāsamaṇo
 māgadhānaṃ giribbajāṃ,
 sabbe saṇjaye netvāna
 kaṃ su dāni nayissati. Vin I 43

prāpto rājagṛhe buddho
 magadhānāṃ (purottame
 sarve saṃjayino) nītāḥ
 kiṃ nu bhūyo nayiṣyatha. CPS III 394 no. 3

āgato śramaṇo gautamo
 magadhānāṃ girivrajaṃ,
 (sarve saṃjaye) netvāna
 kaṃ su nāma nayiṣyati. Mvu III 90

¹⁶. No parallel was found in the standard corpora. Pādas b-c) are similar to *yathā dṛṣṭāni me purā* in the Aśokāvadāna (ed. Mukhopadhyaya: 118), but the context hardly allows a comparison.

¹⁷. Not much is left of this stanza and its beginning and length are difficult to define. If more material broke away from the lateral edge, then even two stanzas may be missing.

¹⁸. Cf. Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann) p. 406: 6f, with a reading as Uv for a-c), but *tenopagajino hy ahaṃ* in pāda d); cf. also CPS II 130 no. 8.

¹⁹. The *-vraṇu* certainly is not the expected *-vrajo*, but possibly miscopied with *-vanam* in mind. In d) *naeśasi* the *si* is written over an original *ti* or *di*, providing a further link to the CPS. The Chinese version of the Vinaya (Waldschmidt 1962: 395b) refers to Rājagṛha too, while the Tibetan does not.

ṇeyam̐ti ya mahavira
 sadhame[ṇa tasa] ++
 (21:) dhameṇa ṇeamaṇasa
 ka y asuye viyaṇam̐da [*2,12 = 23]

nedi hi mahavira
 sadhameṇa tadhakada
 dhameṇa ne'amaṇaṇa
 ka y-asu'a vi'aṇadu. Dhp-G^K 267

nayanti ve mahāvīrā
 saddhammena tathāgatā,
 dhammena niyyamānānaṃ
 kā usūyā vijānataṃ.

Vin I 43 ≈ SN I 127/278 no. 515

nayanti ve mahāvīrā
 saddharṇeṇa tathāgatā
 dhammena nayamānānaṃ
 kā asūyā vijānato. Mvu III 90

nadantīha mahāvīrāḥ
 saddharṇeṇa tathāgatāḥ,
 dharṇeṇa nadamānānāṃ
 ke tv asūyed vijānakāḥ. Uv 21,8

ma kujararo²⁰ ṇagomasava²¹
 dukha hi kujaro nagasamado
 ṇa + + + + + + + +
 (22:) suati bhoṃti²² idaṃ paraṃ gado
 [*2,13 = 24]

mā kuñjara nāgaṃ āsida
 dukkho kuñjara nāgamaṃsado
 na hi nāgahatassa kuñjara
 sugatī hoti ito paraṃ yato. Dhp-P 213

mā kuñjara nāgamāsado
 dukkhaṃ hi kuñjara nāgamāsado,
 na hi nāgahatassa kuñjara
 sugati hoti ito paraṃ yato. Vin II 195²³

aradhavīrya pahidatva
 ṇica dṛiḍhapaṇakrama
 samaga śavaga paśa
 eṣa budha .. + + + [*2,14 = 25]

āraddhavīrye pahitatte
 niccaṃ dālhaparakkame,
 samagge sāvake passa
 eṣā buddhāna vandana.
 ThīG 161; cf. ThG 156 a+b)

+ + + + + + + +
 (23:) caram̐ti amara [vi→si]hu²⁴
 sadhamam̐ ta viyaṇam̐ti
 aduraseva śadvari [*2,15 = 26]

nica hi avi'aṇada
 caradi amara viva
 sadhama du vi'aṇada
 aduraseva śadvari. Dhp-G^K 256

yadā ca avijānantā
 iriyanty amarā iva

²⁰. The first *ra* in *kujarari* is crossed in an unusual way and thus most likely marked as deleted.

²¹. As a correction a strong stroke changed *nāgamāsava* to *nago māsava*.

²². There is a clear curl at the foot of *bho*, so that the *anusvāra* must have been regarded as indispensable.

²³. Cf. Ja V 336.

²⁴. *sihu*: *vi* overwritten with *si*.

ekasaṇa ekaśayo

egayiaṃ atamtri[a]

++++++

(24:) **vaṇe ca ekayo vase** [*2,16 = 27]

vijantanti ca ye dhaṃmaṃ

āturesu anāturā. ThG 276

bālā ihāvijānantaś

caranti hy amarā iva,

vijānatāṃ tu saddharmam

āturasyaiva śarvarī. Uv 22,2

ekasaṇa eka-saya

eka-'iya'i savudu ²⁵

eku ramahi atvaṇa

arañi²⁶ eka'o vasa. Dhp-G^K 259

ekāsaṇaṃ ekaseyyaṃ

eko caram atandito,

eko damayaṃ attānaṃ

vanante²⁷ ramito siyā. Dhp 305

ekāsaṇaṃ ekaśeayaṃ

ekacariyaṃ atandrito,

eko ramayaṃ āttānaṃ

vanānte ramitā siyā. Dhp-P 313

ekāsaṇaṃ tv ekaśayyāṃ

ekacaryāṃ atandritaḥ,

ramayec caikam ātmānaṃ

vaneṣv ekaḥ sadā vaset. Uv 23,2

ekāsaṇaṃ eka-śayyā

eka-cāryyaṃ ata(ndr)i(taḥ)

.....

..... vaset. Subaśi 297

dure saṃte praveśanti²⁸

himavata va parvada

asaṃta _____ na pragaśat[i]

++++++ [*2,17 = 28]

dūre santo pakāśenti

himavanto va pabbato,

asant' ettha na dissanti

rattikhittā yathā sarā. Dhp 304

²⁵. The stanza says the same as ThG 541 where, however, *ekākiyo* expresses what is *eko caram* (Dhp), *ekacaryāṃ* (Uv), *eko ramayaṃ* (Dhp-P) and *ekacāryyaṃ* (Subaśi). Dhp-G^S uses *ekākiya* as well when saying *egayiaṃ*. In the Dhp-G^K too *ekākiya* is much better suited to explain *eka'iya* than **ekacaryāya* which Brough adduced on the basis of the parallels known at that time. The following *i* and *savudu* may both go back to an exemplar where the standard term *atamdrīto* was damaged in the lower part of the characters. The “reconstruction” seems to have interpreted the remnants of *a* as an *i*, being a contracted *ca*. The upper parts of *sa* and *ta* look alike, and so *savudu* (*sarvadā*) crept in where *atamdrīto* was before.

²⁶. All versions use *vana* in pāda d), only Dhp-G^K prefers *araṇya*, possibly as a reaction to local conditions where “woods” are scarce, but “unfriendly areas” galore.

²⁷. On *vanante* vs. *vanānte* Norman 1997: 135.

²⁸. As pāda d) shows, *pragaśanti* must have been the original reading. Here, *ga* was misread as *ve*. The inverse process influenced the engraver of a seal of Vema Takhtu, which now reads *grama-takhtu* instead of *yema-takhtu* (Falk 2009: 111).

(*10-4-1-1)

(25:) acarita braamacariyo
aladhva yo[gaṇa³⁰ dhaṇa]
śati cava vigirṇa va
poraṇaṇi aṇusvara ° [*3,1 = 29]

jī[a] + + + + + + + +
(26:) asa śariraṃ pi jaro uveti ___
sada du dhama ṇa jaro uveti
sato hi ṇa sadha³¹ pravedeaṃti [*3,2 = 30]

dhi [t.] .. + + + + +
+ + + + + + + +
(27:) [maṇo]rama bibo

durāt santaḥ prakāśyante
himavān iva parvataḥ,
asanto na prakāśyante
rātriḥṣiptāḥ śarā yathā. Uv 29,19

[16 stanzas of the *varga*²⁹ are completed.]

+ + + + + + + +
+ + + + + + + +
+ + + + + + + +
poraṇaṇi aṇusvara. Dhp-G^K 139

acaritvā brahmacariyaṃ
aladdhā yobbane dhanam,
senti cāpātikhīṇā va
purāṇāni anutthunaṃ. Dhp 156

acaritvā brahmaceram
aladdhā yovvane dhanam,
śenti cāpādhikinno vā
porāṇāni a'nutthunaṃ. Dhp-P 230

acaritvā brahmacaryam
alabdhvā yauvane dhanam,
śenti cāpātikīṇā vā
paurāṇāny anucintitāḥ. Uv 17,4

jīyati hi raya-radha sucitra
adha śarira bi jara uvedi
sada du dharma na jara uved
sado hi ṣa sabhi praverayadi. Dhp-G^K 160

jīranti ve rājarathā sucittā
atho sarīram pi jaraṃ upeti,
satañ ca dhammo na jaraṃ upeti
santo have sabbhi pavedayanti. Dhp 151

jīryanti vai rājarathāḥ sucitrā
hy atho śarīram api jarām upaiti,
satām tu dharmo na jarām upaiti
santo hi taṃ satsu nivedayanti. Uv 1,28

dh . . jimi jare astu
dru jare
.....

²⁹. The lost part in line 24 should have contained the number of stanzas in the *varga*, sixteen in all. There is no unanimity with the parallels regarding a main topic of the *varga*, so that I assume that the compilers had a sort of *prakīrṇakavarga* in mind.

³⁰. Again *va* misread as *ga*, a mistake that lead from *yema-takhtu* to *grama-takhtu*, s. above fn. 28.

³¹. Probably, *sadha* stands for *satām*, as does *sada* in *pāda* c), with a “spontaneous” aspiration as in *janadhu* (*jānataḥ*) Dhp-GS 3,7, or in *phurv* (*pūrvam*) Dhp-G^S 4,9.

jarae abhimadeti [*3,3 = 31]

[yo vi vaṣaśado jiv·]

sarve mucuparayaṇa

++++++

..++++++ [*3,4 = 32]

(28:) +++ .. **sva duhinam ca vaṣido**

mudam ca drisvaṇa avedacedaso

achicha dhiro ghibadhaṇa[ṇ]· _

++++++ [*3,5 = 33]

(29:) **parijaṇam idaṃ ruvo**

ruvaṇeḍo prabhaṅguṇu

bhesati³² pudasaṃteśo³³

maraṇamta hi jivida [*3,6 = 34]

..... Dhp-G^K 140

dhī taṃ jammī jare atthu
dubbaṇṇakaraṇī jare,
tāva manoramam vimbam
jarāya abhimadditam. SN V 217

dhik tvām astu jare grāmye
virupakaraṇī hy asi,
tathā manoramam bimbam
jarayā hy abhimarditam. Uv 1,29

yo pi vassasataṃ jīve
sabbe maccuparāyaṇā
na kiñci parivajjeti
sabbam evābhimaddati.

SN V 217 Burmese mss

yo 'pi varṣasataṃ jīvet
so 'pi mṛtyuparāyaṇaḥ,
anu hy enam jarā hanti
vyādhir va yadi vāntakaḥ. Uv 1,30

jīṇṇaṇ ca disvā dukkhitaṇ ca byādhitaṃ
mataṇ ca disvā gatam āyusaṃkhayaṃ
tato ahaṃ nikkhamitūna pabbajim
pahāya kāmāni manoramāni. ThG 73

jihmaṃ ca dṛṣṭā dukhitaṃ ca vyādhitaṃ
pretaṇ ca dṛṣṭā na cirassa mānavo,
saṃvego tīppe (?) vipulo (?) ajāyatha
acchecchi dhīro gṛhibandhanāni. Dhp-P 260

jīrṇam ca dṛṣṭveha tathaiva rogiṇam
mṛtaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā vyapayātacetasam,
jahau sa dhīro gṛhabandhanāni
kāmā hi lokasya na supraheyāḥ. Uv 1,27

parijaṇam ida ruvu
ro'a-neḍa pravhaguṇo
bhetsidi pūdi

..... Dhp-G^K 142

parijīṇṇam idaṃ rūpaṃ
roganiḍḍam pabhaṅguṇam,
bhijjati pūtisandeho

³². To be compared with what Norman (1997: 99) collected on the future forms of root *bhid*.

³³. -teśo for -deha could be a miswritten -teyo from -teo with elided *h* as in *patinivaito* (*pratinirvāhitaḥ*) or *siasena* (*siṃhasena*) or *danamue* (*dānamukha*). However, cases where *hy* becomes *ś* are attested and may have influenced plain *h* as well.

marañantaṃ hi jīvitam. Dhp 148

parijinnam idaṃ rūpaṃ
rogaṇīdaṃ prabhaṃguraṃ,
bhijjīhiti<ti> pūtisaṃdeho
maraṇāttam hi jīvitam. Dhp-P 259

parijīrṇaṃ idaṃ ruṇaṃ
rogaṇīḍaṃ praḥṇaṅguraṃ,
bhetsyate pūty asaṇḍehaṃ
maraṇāntaṃ hi jīvitaṃ. Uv 1,34

aṇuyasa [s]. + + + +

(30:) matra janadhu ladhva bhoyaṇo

tanu asa bhavati vedāṇa

śaṇayo jivati ayu palati [*3,7 = 35]

manujassa sadā satīmato
mattaṃ jānato laddhabhojane,
tanu tassa bhavanti vedanā
sanikaṃ jīrati āyu pālayam.

SN I 81+82/185+186 nos. 402+403³⁴

manujassa sadā satīmato
māttam jāniya laddhibhojane,
tanukā 'ssa bhavanti vedanā
śanikam jīrati āyu pālayam. Dhp-P 78

manujasya sadā smṛtīmato
labdhvā bhojanamātrajānataḥ,
tanukāśya bhavanti vedanāḥ
śanakair jīryati āyuh pālayam. Uv 29,14

mum̃ce purado [mum̃c]. + + +

++++ (31:) bhavasa parago

sarvatra vimutamanasa

ṇa puṇu jatijaro uveśasi [*3,8 = 36]

muju pura muju pachadu
maḥadu muju bhavasa parako
sarvatra vimutamonaṣo
na punu jadijara uvehisi. Dhp-G^K 161³⁵

muñca pure muñca pacchato
majjhe muñca bhavassa pāragū,
sabbattha vimuttamānaso
na punaṇ jātijaram upehisi. Dhṛp 348

muñca pure muñca pacchato
majjhe muñca bhavassa paragu,
sabbattha vimuttamanaso
na puno jatijaram upehisi. Dhp-P 150

muṁca purato muṁca paścato
madhye muṁca bhavasya pāragah,
sarvatra vimuktamānaso
na punar jātijarām upesyasi. Uv 29,57

³⁴. \approx Ja II 294 c) *tanū tassa* \approx Dhp-a III 265 c) *tanu tassa*, B *tanuk'assa*.

³⁵ Cf. Caillat 1978 for an explanation of this form; Dhp-G^s presents standard Gāndhārī instead.

ajara jivamaṇeṇa

ḍaṣamaṇeṇa ṇiva[ti]

++++++

(32:) yovakṣemo aṇuta [*3,9A = 37A] ³⁶

ajaro jivamaṇeṇa

ḍaṣamaṇeṇa ṇivuti

ṇimesa paramo śodhi

yoyakṣemo aṇutaro [*3,9B = 37B] ³⁸

ayara jiyamaṇeṇa

ḍajamaṇeṇa nivrudi

nimedha³⁷ parama śodhi

yoka-kṣemu aṇutara. Dhp-G^K 159

ajaro jiamaneṇa

ḍaṣamaṇ(*ena) ṇivudi

ṇimesa parama śati

yoakṣemo (*aṇutaro) Baums (2009: 564)

ajaraṃ jīramāneṇa

tappamāneṇa nibbutiṃ

nimmissaṃ paramaṃ santiṃ

yogakkhemaṃ anuttaraṃ. ThG 32

(33:) uvaṇiyati jivida apomayu

jarovaṇidasa ṇa bhati trana

ede bhaya maraṇa prekṣama³⁹

puṇṇāni kurvea suhavaga + [*3,10 = 38]

upaṇīyati jīvitam appam āyu

jarūpanītassa na santi tāṇā,

etaṃ bhayaṃ maraṇe pekkhamāno

puṇṇāni kayirātha sukhāvahāni.

SN I 2/4 no. 3 = AN I 155, ab) Ja IV 398

(34:) uvaṇiati jivido apomayu

jarovaṇidasa ṇa bhoti traṇa

ede bhaya maraṇa prekṣamaṇa

logamiṣa pra·aha śa .. + + [*3,11 = 39]

upaṇīyati jīvitam appam āyu

jarūpanītassa na santi tāṇā

etaṃ bhayaṃ maraṇe pekkhamāno

lokāmisam pajahe santipekkho.

SN I 2/4 no. 4 = AN I 155

(35:) [a]cayaṃti kale tarayati rati[a?]__

[vaya puṇu aṇ(u)p(ru)[ve jaham]ma

[ido] bha[yamaraṇ] pre[kṣamaṇa]

++++++ [*3,12 = 40]

accenti kālā tarayanti rattiyo

vayoguṇā anupubbaṃ jahanti.

etaṃ bhayaṃ maraṇe pekkhamāno

puṇṇāni kayirātha sukhāvahāni.

SN I 3/5 no. 5; ab) Ja IV 487

(36:) [aca]yaṃti kale tvarayat[i] radiyo_

vayo puṇu⁴⁰ aṇapuṇa⁴¹ aṇapruve jahamti

accenti kālā tarayanti rattiyo

vayoguṇā anupubbaṃ jahanti,

³⁶. This stanza, with some variations, is immediately repeated in a more complete form.

³⁷. The future *nimmissaṃ* in ThG has an equivalent *nimesa* in Dhp-G^S. The multiple *nimedha* in Khotan (Dhp-G^K 156-159), which Brough derives from *nir-mā*, is most likely to be explained as a “wrong Gandharisation” of a not understood *nimesa*.

³⁸. Because of a large knothole the line is ended here.

³⁹. No *na* or *no* closes *prekṣama*.

⁴⁰. *vayo puṇu* parallels *vayoguṇā* and can be explained with the rule that a velar stop at the beginning of the second member of a compound can be elided; cf. *ekaiṭa* from *ekakūṭa*, or *dharmaiṭa* from *dharmagupta*. If *vayoguṇā* had an intermediate form of **vayoiṇa* then *uṇa* may have been faultily restored to *puṇa*.

⁴¹. The dot after *aṇapuṇa* marks this word as deleted.

edo bhayo maraṇa prekṣamaṇa °
[*3,13 = 41]

etaṃ bhayaṃ maraṇe pekkhamāno
lokāmisam pajahe santipekkho.
SN I 3/5 no. 6

acayati aho ++
++++++
(37:) ayu kṣiyati mracaṇa ____
kuṇaḍiṣu yasodayo - [*3,14 = 42]

atīyānti hy ahorātrā
jīvitam coparudhyate,
āyuh kṣīyati martyānām
kunadīṣu yathaudakam. Uv 1,18

° asa pavaṇi kamaṇi
karo balo ṇa bujati
svagehi kamehi [ya] +
++++++ [*3,15 = 43]

atha pāpāni kammāni
karam bālo na bujjhati,
sehi kammehi dummedho
aggidaḍḍho va tappati. Dhp 136

sa cet pāpāni karmāni
kurvaṃ bālo na budhyate,
karmabhiḥ svaḥ tu durmedhā
hy agnidagdhaiva tapyate. Uv 9,12

(38:) sahi ege ṇa dīṣati ____
praṇe⁴² dīṭṭha bahojaṇa
praṇi ege ṇa dīṣati ____
saī dīṭṭha bahujaṇa [*3,16 = 44]

sadi eki na dīṣadi
pradu dīṭṭha baho-jaṇo
pradu eki na dīṣadi
sadi dīṭṭha bahojaṇo Dhp-G^K 151

sāyaṃ eke na dissanti
pāto dīṭṭhā bahujjanā,
pāto eke na dissanti
sāyaṃ dīṭṭhā bahujjanā. Ja IV 127 = VI 28

sāyaṃ eke na dṛśyante
kālyaṃ dṛṣṭā mahājanāḥ,
kālyaṃ caḥke na dṛśyante
sāyaṃ dṛṣṭā mahājanāḥ. Uv 1,7

tatra ko viśpiṣe mraca
.. ++++++
(39:) dahara yeva mriyaṃti
ṇa⁴³ ṇari ca egaṣo [*3,17 = 45]

tatra ko viśpaṣi maco
daharo si di jividi
dahara vi miyadi
nara nari ca ekada. Dhp-G^K 152

daharāpi hi mīyanti
narā ca atha nāriyo,
tatha ko vissase poso
daharo 'mhīti jīvite. Ja VI 26*

tatra ko viśvasen martyo
daharo 'smīti jīvite,
daharāpi mriyante hi

^{42.} *praṇe* and *praṇi* could probably be misreadings from a carelessly written *pradu*; alternatively they can be derived from *prāhṇe*, “in the early morning”.

^{43.} After the first *ṇa* the *ra* was omitted.

° yasa phalasa pakasa
nico padaṇado bhayo
eva ja[d]· + + + +
+ + + + + + + + [*3,18 = 46]

(40:) ye ca vurdha ye ca dahara °
ye ca majimaporuṣa
aṇapruvo pravataṃti
phala paka va baṃdhaṇa _ [*3,19 = 47]

[s]· + + + + + + +
+ + + + + + +
(41:) yasa[ka]ma gramiṣati
puṇḍapava-phal(o)vaga
niraya pavakamaṃta __
pu + + + + + + + + [*3,20 = 48]

+ + + + + + + +
(42:) puṇḍa kurvea ta[. . .]
puṇḍa hi paralosmi
pradiṭṭha bhaṃti pranina _ [*3,21 = 49]

narā nāryaś ca-n-ekaśaḥ. Uv 1,8
yadha phalaṇa pakana
nice padaṇado bhayo
emu jadasa macasa
nica maraṇado bhayo. Dhp-G^K 147

phalānaṃ iva pakkānaṃ
pāto patanato bhayaṃ
evaṃ jātānaṃ maccānaṃ
niccaṃ maraṇato bhayaṃ. Sn 579

yathā phalānāṃ pakvānāṃ
nityaṃ patanato bhayaṃ,
evaṃ jātasya martyasya
nityaṃ maraṇato bhayaṃ. Uv 1,11

ye vrudha ye ya dahara
ye ca majīma-poruṣa
aṇupova [pravaya]di
phala paka va banaṇa. Dhp-G^K 146

ye ca vṛddhā ye ca dahrā
ye ca madhyamapuruṣāḥ,
anupūrvam pravrajanti
phalaṃ pakvaṃ va bandhanāt. Uv 1,10

ye ca vuddhā ye ca daharā
ye ca majjhima-porisā. Jā VI 572, 2325 ab)

sabbe sattā marissanti
maraṇantaṃ hi jīvitam,
yathākammaṃ gamissanti
puṇṇapāpaphalūpagā,
nirayaṃ pāpakammantā
puṇṇakammā ca suggaṭiṃ. SN I 97/218, 431

sarve satvā mariṣyanti
maraṇantaṃ hi jīvitam,
yathākarma gamiṣyanti
puṇyapāpaphalopagāḥ. Uv 1,23

tasmā kareyya kalyānaṃ
nicayaṃ samparāyikaṃ,
puṇṇāni paralokasmiṃ
patitṭhā honti paṇinaṃ. SN I 97/218, 432

tasmāt kuruta puṇyānāṃ
nicayaṃ sampaṇāyikaṃ,
puṇyāni paraloke hi
pratiṣṭhā prāṇināṃ hi sā. Uv 5,22

puña deva pra[śaṃśanti]
saṃ[ma] + + + + + [*3,22 = 50]⁴⁴

+ + + + (43:) kalagada bahujaṇa __
salohimda kaṃdida⁴⁵ drigharatro __
taṃ tadiśo viparinamo ñadina __
taṃ drigharatro .. + + + + + + + +
(44:) dṛiḍhavirya-nikramo ° [*3,23 = 51]⁴⁶
bhave bhaya drisva [*3,24 = 52]

sa praṃñāṣavagho _

dukha hi jati-maraṇo
punapuna avi śa[ma]
.. + + + + + + + [*3,25 = 53]⁴⁷

(45:) yasa rati-vavasena⁴⁸ ____
ayu-v-apadaro siya ____
apodago va matsana
ki nu teṣa kumaleda _ [*3,26 = 54]

puṇyaṃ devāḥ praśaṃsanti
samacaryāṃ ca yaś caret,
iha cānindito bhavati
pretya svarge ca modate. Uv 5,23

priyaṃ mṛtaṃ kālagataṃ
jñātayaḥ sahitāḥ sthitāḥ,
śocanti dīrgham adhvānaṃ
duḥkho hi priyaśaṃgamaḥ. Uv 5,7

bhave cāhaṃ bhayaṃ dṛṣtvā
bhūyaś ca vibhavaṃ bhave,
tasmād bhavaṃ nābhinande
nandī ca vibhavana me. Uv 29,22

tatha-r-iva śamaṇā prabhūtapraṃñā
ayirā ayirapathesu sicchamānā,
jāti-jarāmarāṇabhayaḍḍittā dukkhāṭṭā
vyāyamanti api prāpuṇema śāntiṃ.

Dhp-P 120

yasa radi vivasiṇa
ayu aparado si'a
apodake va matsaṇa
ki teṣa u kumulaṇa.⁴⁹ Dhp-G^K 145

yassa ratyā vivasane
āyuraṃ appataram siyā,
appodake va macchānaṃ
kin nu komāraṇaṃ tahiṃ. Ja VI 26, vs. 101

yeṣāṃ rātridivāpāye
hy āyuraṃ alpataraṃ bhavet,
alpodake va matsyānāṃ
kā nu teṣāṃ ratir bhavet. Uv 1,33

yasyāṃ ratyāṃ vyatītāyāṃ

⁴⁴. Pādas c+d) are definitely left unwritten.

⁴⁵. *kaṃdida* probably absolute for *kanditvā*, “having bewailed”.

⁴⁶. The parallelism with Uv does not reach very far. The metre is different and only a few notions are the same. It is even unclear if the text consists of one or two stanzas. Although the text could be scanned in many ways, the pronounced spaces suggest a mixture of 11 and 12 syllables per *pāda*.

⁴⁷. The parallelism with Dhp-P is very faint, but a true equivalent could not be traced.

⁴⁸. Skt *rātrivivāsena*. Brough (1962: 221) seems to have taken *radi* as an equivalent for *ratyā* in Ja. The possible metathesis *vavasane* → *vavasina* can certainly be abandoned for the instrumental, likewise considered by Brough; cf. Mvu 3.387 *rātrivivāsato*.

⁴⁹. The Dhp-GS version does away with the difficulties Brough (1962: 221) encountered with *u kumulaṇa*. Obviously, the scribe of Dhp-G^K rather thought of Skt *kumuda* than of *kumārātā*, which is present in the parallel Mbh 13.134,57 appendix 15,4062f. For r→l cf. *jalayuga*, Skt *jarāyuga* at Wardak or *saleloa* (*saroruhaṃ*) in Lenz 2003: 42.

yam eva pa[ḍh]· + + +
 + + + + + + + +
 (46:) abhuḥhido so vrayati ____
 so gatva na nivatati ____ [*3,27 = 55]

sado vrayama anivatamana ____
 diva ca rati ca palujamana ____
 me[ts]· + + + + + + + +
 (47:) dukhana jatimaraṇeṇa phuṭha ____
 [*3,28 = 56]

tasva sada jaṇarada samahidaṃ
 adavino jatikṣayatadaśa ____
 maro saseno abhi[bh]· + + +
 (48:) bhavasa jatimaraṇa[sa paraga] ____
 [*3,29 = 57]

[20]-4-4-1

asvajāyamala maṃtra
 aṇ[u]ḥhaṇa-mala ghara ____
 malo malosā kosi[jo]
 + + + + + (49:) malo [*4,1 = 58]

malo ist[r]i ducarido ____
 matśariyo dadado malo
 malo hi pavaga dhama °

āyur alpataṃ bhavet,
 gādhodake matsya iva
 kiṃ nu tasya kumārātā. Mbh 13, app.15,4062

yam eva paḍhama radi
 gabhi vasati māṇavo
 aviḥhido so vayadi
 so gachu na nivatadi. Dhp-G^k 144

yam ekarattiṃ paṭhamam
 gabbhe vasati māṇavo,
 abbhuttḥito va sayati
 sa gacchaṃ na nivattati. Ja IV 494

yām eva prathamām rātriṃ
 garbhe vasati māṇavaḥ,
 aviṣṭhitaḥ sa vrajati
 gataś ca na nivartate. Uv 1,6

sadā vrajanti hy anivartamānā
 divā ca rātrau ca viluḍyamānāḥ,
 matsya ivātīva hi tapyamānā
 duḥkhena jātīmaraṇeṇa yuktāḥ. Uv 1,31

tasmā sadā jhānaratā samāhitā
 ātāpino jātikhayantadassino,
 mārāṃ sasenaṃ abhibhūya bhikkhavo
 bhavatha jātīmaraṇassa pāragā. It 40f.

tasmāt sadā dhyānaratāḥ samāhitā
 hy ātāpino jātījarāntadarśinaḥ,
 mārāṃ sasainyaṃ hy abhibhūya bhikṣavo
 bhaveta jātīmaraṇasya pāragāḥ. Uv 1,42

[29 stanzas of the *jarā-varga completed.]

asajjhāyamalā mantā
 anuttḥānamalā gharā,
 malaṃ vaṇṇassa kosajjaṃ
 pamādo rakkhato malaṃ. Dhp 241

asajjhāyamalā vedā
 anuttḥānamalā gharā,
 malo vaṇṇassa kosajjaṃ
 pramādo rakkhatāṃ malo. Dhp-P 157

mal' itthiyā duccharitaṃ
 maccheraṃ dadato malaṃ,
 malā ve pāpakā dhammā

asvi loge parasvi ca _ [*4,2 = 59]

ado malo maladaro

++++++

(50:) ede maṃla prahatvana

nimalaṃ bhoṣa bhikṣavo [*4,3 = 60]

ayasa hi malo samuṭṭhida

tado uṭṭhaya-m-eva khayati

eva aṇiśama .. +++

(51:) svagani⁵⁰ nayati dugati [*4,4 = 61]

anupruvena mesavi

stogostogo khanakhana

kamaro rayidaṃs eva

niddhame ma[la] +++ [*4,5 = 62]

asmiṃ loke paramhi ca. Dhp 242

malo istiye duccharitaṃ

maccheraṃ dadatāṃ malo,

malo pāpāni kaṃmāni

asmiṃ loke paramhi ca. Dhp-P 158

tato malā malataraṃ

avijjā paramaṃ malaṃ,

etaṃ malaṃ pahatvāna

nimmalā hotha bhikkhavo. Dhp 243

tato malataraṃ brūmi

avijjā maraṇaṃ malaṃ,

ete male prahattāna

niṃmalā caratha bhikkhavo. Dhp-P 159

ayasā va malaṃ samuṭṭhitaṃ

tatuṭṭhāya tam eva khādati,

evaṃ atidhonacāriṇaṃ

sāni⁵¹ kammāni nayanti duggatiṃ. Dhp 240

ayasa hi malaḥ samutthitaḥ

sa tadutthāya tam eva khādati,

evaṃ hy aṇiśāmyacāriṇaṃ

svāni karmāni nayanti durgatiṃ. Uv 9,19

ayasā tu malo samuṭṭhito

tato uṭṭhāya tam eva khādati,

em eva vidhūnacāriyaṃ

sakāni kaṃmāni nayanti doggatiṃ. Dhp-P 160

anupubbena medhāvī

thokaṃthokaṃ⁵² khaṇekhaṇe

kammāro rajatass' eva

niddhame malam attano. Dhp 239

anupūrveṇa medhāvī

stokaṃ stokaṃ kṣaṇe kṣaṇe,

karmāro rajatasyaiva

nirdhamen malam ātmanaḥ. Uv 2,10

anupūrvveṇa medhāvī

thokathokaṃ khaṇe khaṇe,

kammāro rajatasseva

^{50.} *karmani* was left out in haplography.

^{51.} Von Hinüber & Norman (1994: 68) prefer *sakakammāni* over *sāni kammāni*, which is found in the Burmese and Thai mss and further supported by all our parallels.

^{52.} Von Hinüber & Norman (1994: 68) prefer *thokathokaṃ* as in Patna over the *thokaṃthokaṃ* of the Thai mss. As I see *āmreḍita* compounds also the first nasal would be compulsory.

++++++

(52:) yamapuruṣa vi ya de uñhida ____
 uyodamuhe⁵⁴ va tiṭṭhasi
 paseya pi ya de na vijjati [*4,6 = 63]

u[y·m·] ++++++

(53:) kamaro rayidaṃ va niddhame ____
 nidhatamalo ana _ gano
 diviya ariyabhūmi eśasi [*4,7 = 64]

ekamulo du .. +++

++++++

(54:) samudro badaśavaṇo
 padalo pa[dari mun]i [*4,8 = 65]

pradur abhuṣi magadhesu phurv·
 [dha·o aśudho sama] .. ++++

++++++ (55:)

śunaṃtu dhammo vimuleṇaṇubudhi ____
 [*4,9 = 66]

yasa ṣatriśati soda °

maṇopraśavaṇo bhuyo

vaha vahaṃti dru[dri] ..

++++++ [*4,10 = 67]

niddhame malam āttano. Dhp-P 163

paṇḍupalāso va dāni si
 yamapurisā pi ca te⁵³ upatṭhitā
 uyyoga-mukhe ca tiṭṭhasi
 pātheyyam pi ce te na vijjati. Dhp 235

pāṇḍupalāso ca dāni si
 yamapuruṣā pi ca te upatṭhitā,
 uyyogamukhe ca tiṭṭhasi
 pātheyyaṃ pi ca te na vijjati. Dhp-P 161

so karohi dīpam attano
 khippaṃ vāyama paṇḍito bhava,
 niddhantamalo anaṅgaṇo
 dibbaṃ ariyabhūmiṃ ehisi. Dhp 236

uyyamassa ghaṭassa āttanā
 kaṃmāro rajataṃ va niddhame,
 niddhāntamalo anaṅgano
 bitiyaṃ ayirabhūmiṃ esi. Dhp-P 162

uttiṣṭhata vyāyamata
 kurudhvaṃ dvīpam ātmanaḥ,
 karmāro rajatasyaiva
 haradhvaṃ malam ātmanaḥ,
 nirdhāntamalā hy anaṅgaṇā
 na punar jātijarām upeṣyatha. Uv 16,3

ekamūlaṃ dvirāvaṭṭaṃ
 timalaṃ pañcapattharaṃ,
 samuddaṃ dvādasāvaṭṭaṃ
 pātālaṃ atarī isi. SN I 32/68, 147

pātur ahosi magadhesu pubbe
 dhammo asuddho samalehi cintito,
 avāpuretaṃ amatassa dvāraṃ
 suṇantu dhammaṃ vimalenānubuddhaṃ.

SN I 137⁵⁵

yassa chattimsatī sotā
 manāpassavanā bhusā,
 vahā vahanti duddiṭṭhaṃ
 saṃkappā rāganissitā. Dhp 339

^{53.} Von Hinüber & Norman (1994: 67) prefer *taṃ* over *te* against the Burmese edition. As does Patna, our ms also speaks for *te*.

^{54.} The *d* in *uyodamuhe* is rather a misread *ga* than a *d* as hiatus bridger, although *sadi* in Dhp-G^K 151 for expected *sai* (*sāyaṃ*) could be another case.

^{55.} The Pali stanza is found several times in the Majjhimanikāya and the Vinaya, but more adaptations from the SN are found in this *varga* and so this origin is the most likely.

(56:) raga doṣo ca moho ca
 puruṣo pavacedaso
 hiṃsaṃti atmasabhuda
 tvayasara bha⁵⁶ sva pha[la] [*4,11 = 68]

++++++
 (57:) ki ti ayinaśaḍiya
 ataro gahana kitva
 bahiro parimajasi [*4,12 = 69]

10-1-1

yaṣa vi ruyido pupho
 [vanavata] + + + +
 (58:) eva subhaṣido vaya _
 aphalo [bh](o)[t](i a)[k](ur)[vado] °
 [*5,1 = 70]

yassa chattrīśatiṃ sotā
 mānāphassamayā bhriśā,
 vāhā vahanti dudriṣṭiṃ
 saṃkappā ggredhaniśśitā. Dhp-P 237

srotāṃsi yasya ṣaṭtrimśan
 manahprasravaṇāni hi /
 vahanti nityaṃ durdrṣṭeḥ
 saṃkalpair gredhaniḥśritaiḥ. Uv 31,29

lobho doso ca moho ca
 purisaṃ pāpacetasa,
 hiṃsanti attasambhūtā
 tacasāraṃ va sam phalaṃ.

SN I 98/219 no. 433 ≈ It 45

ki di jaḍa'i drumedha
 ki di ayiṇa-śaḍi'a
 adara gahaṇa kitva
 bahire parimajasi. Dhp-G^K 2

kin te jaṭāhi dummedha
 kiṃ te ajinasāṭiyā,
 abbhantaraṃ te gahanaṃ
 bāhiraṃ parimajjasi. Dhp 394

kiṃ te jaṭābhir durbuddhe
 kiṃ cāpy ajinaśāṭibhiḥ,
 abhyantaraṃ te gahanaṃ
 bāhyakaṃ parimārjasi. Uv 33,6

[12 stanzas of the *malavarga completed.]

yatha vi ruyida puṣu
 vaṇamada agana'a
 emu subhaṣida vaya
 aphala . . akuvadu. Dhp-G^K 290

yathāpi ruciraṃ pupphaṃ
 vaṇṇavantaṃ agandhakaṃ,
 evaṃ subhāsitā vācā
 aphalā hoti akubbato. Dhp 51 = ThG 323

yathāpi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ
 varṇavat syād agandhavat,
 evaṃ subhāsitā vācā
 niṣphalāsāv akurvataḥ. Uv 18,6

⁵⁶. bha probably arose from a miscopied va.

ya⁵⁷

yasa vi ruyi[da p|u[ph]o _
vaṇavaṃto sugaṃdhiyo
eva subhaṣido va + + + +
(59:) bh[oti] kurvada [*5,2 = 71]

yasa vi pupharaṣiyo
ku[ya] malaguna bahu
eva jadena mracana
katavo kuśalo [va→ba]h(u) [*5,3 = 72]

+ + + + + + +
(60:) vaṇagaṃdho aheḍayo _
paredi rasam adaya _
eva game muṇi cara ° [*5,4 = 73]

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ
vannavantam agandhakam,
evaṃ subhāṣitā vācā
aphalā hoti akurvato. Dhp-P 125

yatha vi ruyida puṣu
vaṇamada sagana'a
emu subhaṣida vaya
saphala bhodi kuvadu. Dhp-G^K 291
yathāpi ruciraṃ pupphaṃ
vaṇnavantam sagandhakam,
evaṃ subhāṣitā vācā
saphalā hoti sakubbato. Dhp 52 ≈ ThG 324

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ
vannavantam saganḍhakam,
evaṃ subhāṣitā vācā
saphalā hoti kurvvato. Dhp-P 126

Cf. Subaṣi 222a+b, 223a+b.

yada vi puṣpa-raṣisa
kuya mala-guṇa baho
emu jadena maceṇa
katavi Dhp-G^K 293

yathā pi puppharāsimhā
kayirā mālāguṇe bahū,
evaṃ jātena maccena
kattabbaṃ kusalaṃ bahum. Dhp 53

yathāpi puṣparāṣibhyaḥ
kuryān mālāguṇāṃ bahūn,
evaṃ jātena martyena
kartavyaṃ kuśalaṃ bahu. Uv 18,10

yathā pi puṣparāṣimhā
kayirā mālāguṇe bahū,
evaṃ jātena māccena
kātavvaṃ kuśalaṃ bahum. Dhp-P 130

yatha vi bhamaru puṣpa
vaṇa-gana aheḍa'i
paridi rasam ada'i
emu gami muṇi cara. Dhp-G^K 292

⁵⁷. This letter is written on a rough part of the bark. To avoid a separation from the rest of the stanza it is repeated further on.

yathāpi bhamaro pupphaṃ
vaṇṇagandhaṃ aheṭṭhayaṃ,
paleti rasam ādāya
evaṃ gāme munī care. Dhp 49

yathā pi bhramaro puṣpā
vannagandham aheḍayaṃ
praḍeti rasam ādāya
evaṃ ggrāme *munī* care. Dhp-P 127

yathāpi bhramaraḥ puṣpād
varṇagandhāv aheṭṭhayan,
paraiti rasam ādāya
tathā grāmaṃ muniś caret. Uv 18,8

.....
.....

(parait)i rasam ādāya
evaṃ g(r)āme (m)u(n)i(ś) . . . Subaśi 224

ṇa pareṣu vilomaye

ṇa pareṣu krida[giḍ].

++++++

(61:) **samaṇi viṣamaṇi ca** [*5,5 = 74]

na pareṣa vilomaṇi

na pareṣa kidakida

atvaṇo i samikṣe'a

samaṇi viṣamaṇi ca. Dhp-G^K 271

na paresaṃ vilomāni

na paresaṃ katākatam,

attano va avekkheyya

katāni akatāni ca. Dhp 50

na pareṣāṃ vilomāni

na pareṣāṃ kṛtākṛtam,

ātmanas tu samīkṣeta

samāni viṣamāni ca. Uv 18,9

na paresaṃ vilomāni

na paresam katā'katam,

āttanā ye aveccheyā

katāni akatāni ca. Dhp-P 309

Cf. Subaśi 225, only a) preserved.

yadha sagara-'uḍasa

uḍidasa maha-pathe

padumu tatra ja'e'a

suyigaṇa maṇoramu. Dhp-G^K 303

yathā saṃkāradhānasmiṃ

ujjhitasmiṃ mahāpathe

padumaṃ tattha jāyetha

sucigandhaṃ manoramaṃ. Dhp 58

yasa saṃkara-guḍasvi ____

ujidasvi mahapase ____

paduma tatra jayea ____

suyigaṃdho mano .. + [*5,6 = 75]

+ + + + + + +

(62:) aṃdhahuda prusujana

adiroyati (pa→pu)ñaya _

saṃme-saṃbudha-ṣavaya _ [*5,7 = 76]

na puphagaṃdho pradivado va[ya] +

+ + + + + + +

(63:) satana gaṃdho pradivadaṃ vayati _

sarva diśa sapuruṣo pravayadi °

[*5,8 = 77]

yathā saṃkārakūṭe tu
vyujjhite hi mahāpathe,
padmaṃ tatra tu jāyeta
śucigandhi manoramam. Uv 18,12

yathā saṃkārakūṭamhi
ujjhitamhi mahāpathe
padumaṃ ubbhidaṃ assa
śucigandhaṃ manoramam. Dhp-P 135

yath(ā) saṅkārakuṭasm(i)
ūjh(i)t(a)sm(i) m(ah)āpathe,
pa(dmam) . . . jāyeta
śuci-g(a)n(dham) manorama. Subaṣi 226

e[*mu*] saghasa-dhama'u
añña-hodi prudhijaṇe
abhiroyadi prañña'i
same-sabudha-ṣavaka. Dhp-G^K 304

evaṃ saṃkārabhūtesu
andhabhūte puthujjane,
atirocati paññāya
sammāsambuddhasāvako. Dhp 59

evaṃ saṃkārabhūte 'smin
andhabhūte pṛthagjane,
prajñāyā vyatirocante
samyaksambuddhaśrāvakāḥ. Uv 18,13

evaṃ saṃkārabhūtesu
andhabhūte pṛthujjane,
atirocanti praññāya
saṃmasabuddhasāvakā. Dhp-P 136

ev(aṃ saṅ)k(ā)rabh(ū)t(asmi)
a(n)dha
. . (ro)cati prajāya
samyaksambuddhaśr(ā)va(ka)ḥ. Subaṣi 227

. . . . pradivada vayadi
na mali'a takara canaṇa va
sadaṇa gano pradivada va'idi
sarva diśa sapuruṣo pada'idi. Dhp-G^K 295

na pupphagandho paṭivātam eti
na candanaṃ tagaramallikā vā,
sataṇ ca gandho paṭivātam eti
sabbā diśa sappuriso pavāti. Dhp 54

na puṣpagandhaḥ prativātam eti

tagara caṁdanam ceva ____
 upa(1e→1o) adha var[ṣ]. +
 + + + + + + +
 (64:) śīlagamḍho anutaro ° [*5,9 = 78]

teṣam sampanaśīlaṇi ____
 apramādhavihāriṇam ____
 samamdaññāvimutanam ____
 gati maro na vijati ____ [*5,10 = 79]

puphaṇi .. + + + +
 (65:) vasita-manasa nara ____
 suto gamo mahoho va ____

na vāhniṇāt tagarāe candanād vā,
 satām tu gandhaḥ prativātam eti
 sarvā diśaḥ satpuruṣaḥ pravāti. Uv 6,16

na puṣpagandho paṭivātam eti
 na candanam tagaram vāhlikam vā,
 satān tu gandho paṭivātam eti
 sabbā diśā sappuruṣo pravāti. Dhp-P 121

..... ya vi

 ... gana-ja[da]ṇa
 śīla-gano ivutama. Dhp-G^K 296

candanam tagaram vā pi
 uppalam aṭṭha vassikī,
 etesaṃ gandhajātānam
 sīlagandho anuttaro. Dhp 55

tagarāc candanāc cāpi
 vārṣikāyās tathotpalāt,
 etebhyo gandhajātebhyah
 śīlagandhas tv anuttarah. Uv 6,17

candanam tagaram cāpi
 uppalam aṭṭha vāssikim
 etesaṃ gandhajātānam
 sīlagandho anuttaro. Dhp-P 122

... baṇa-śīlaṇa
 apramāda-vihariṇa
 samadañña-vimutaṇa
 gadi maro na vinadi. Dhp-G^K 297

tesam sampannaśīlānam
 appamādhavihāriṇam,
 sammadaññāvimuttānam
 māro maggaṃ na vindati. Dhp 57

teṣaṃ viśuddhaśīlānam
 apramādhavihāriṇām,
 samyagājñāvimuktānam
 māro mārgaṃ na vindati. Uv 6,19

tesam sampannaśīlānam
 apramādhavihāriṇām,
 sammadaññāvimuttānam
 māro māggaṃ na viṇḍati. Dhp-P 124

puṣaṇi yeva payiṇadu
 vasita-maṇasa nara
 sutu gamu mahoho va

aṃta[g adae] gachati __ [*5,11 = 80]

puphāṇi r-eva prayaṇaṃ[ta] __

vasita-manasa⁵⁸ ṇara __

[a] .. + + + + + +

(66:) **mucu adaye gachati** __ [*5,12 = 81]⁵⁹

phenoamo kayam idaṃ viditva __

mariyudhamo avisambasana __

chetvana marasa pravośpu[ya?] ..

.. + + + + + + + + + + [*5,13 = 82]

ada Dhp-G^k 294

pupphāṇi h' eva pacinantam
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ,
suttaṃ gāmaṃ mahogho va
maccu ādāya gacchati. Dhp 47

puṣpāṇy eva pracinvantam
vyāsaktamanasaṃ naram,
suptaṃ grāmaṃ mahaughaiva
mṛtyur ādāya gacchati. Uv 18,14

puṣpāṇi heva pracinantam
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ
suttaṃ ggrāmaṃ mahogho vā
maccu-r-ādāya gacchati. Dhp-P 128

taṃ putrapāsusaṃmattaṃ
vyāsaktamanasaṃ naram,
suptaṃ vyāghraṃ mahaugho vā
mṛtyur ādāya gacchati. Mbh 12.169,17

pupphāṇi h' eva pacinantam
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ,
atitaṃ yeva kāmesu
antako kurute vasaṃ. Dhp 48

puṣpāṇi heva pracinantam
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ,
asaṃpuṭṭṇesu kāmesu (sic)
antako kurute vaśe. Dhp-P 129

puṣpāṇy eva pracinvantam
vyāsaktamanasaṃ naram,
atrptam eva kāmeṣu
tv antakaḥ kurute vaśam. Uv 18,15

phenovamu kayam ida viditva
mariyi bhuda'i
chetvaṇa marasa papavuse'aṇa
a Dhp-G^k 300

phenūpamaṃ kāyam imaṃ viditvā
marīcidhammaṃ abhisambudhāno,
chetvāna mārassa papupphakāṇi
adassanaṃ maccurājassa gacche. Dhp 46

⁵⁸. For the rare use of *na* alongside *ṇa* cf. § on palaeography, p. 57.

⁵⁹. The scribe of the exemplar remembered the variance between *antaka* and *mṛtyu* in the two verses 5,11+12, also the differences in the pāda c), but not the differences in the verbal expression in the pāda d).

phenopamaṃ lokam imaṃ vidittā
marīcidhammaṃ abhisambudhānāṃ,
chettāna mārassa prapūṣpakāṇi
assaṃśanaṃ maccurājassa gacche. Dhp-P 134

phenopamaṃ kāyaṃ imaṃ viditvā
marīcidharmaṃ paribudhya caiva,
chitveha mārasya tu puṣpakāṇi
tv adarśanaṃ mṛtyurājasya gacchet. Uv 18,18

(67:) ko imo paḍhavi vieṣeti ⁶⁰

(68:) yamalogam ca imo sadeva ..

ko dhamapado sudeśido ____

kuśalo⁶¹ p·mam [iva p· ye·i..] [*5,14 = 83]

.....

[yama-loka ji] ida sadevaka,

ko dhama-pada sudeśida

kuśala puṣa viva payeṣidi. Dhp-G^K 301

ko imaṃ paṭhaviṃ vicessati
yamalokaṃ ca imaṃ sadevakaṃ,
ko dhammapadaṃ sudesitaṃ
kusalo puppham iva ppacessati. Dhp 44

ko imaṃ pathaviṃ vijehiti
yamalokaṃ va imaṃ sadevakaṃ,
ko dhammapade sudeśite
kuśalo puṣam iva prajehiti. Dhp-P 131

ko imāṃ pṛthivīm vijesya
yamalokaṃ ca tathā sadevakaṃ,
ko dharmapadaṃ sudeśitaṃ
kuśalaḥ puṣam iva pracesya. Uv 18,1

_____ budho paḍha .. + + + +

(69:) yamalogam ca imo sadevago _

budha dhamapado sudeśida ____

kuśali puphamm iva prayeṣati [*5,15 = 84]

budhu pradha . . . ṣidi

yamaloka ji ida sadevaka,

budhu dhamapada sudeśida

kuśala puṣa viva payiṣidi. Dhp-G^K 302

sekho paṭhaviṃ vijessati
yamalokaṃ ca imaṃ sadevakaṃ,
sekho dhammapadaṃ sudesitaṃ
kusalo puppham iva ppacessati. Dhp 45

..... (vi)c(e)ṣyati⁶²

yama-lokañ (ca) imaṃ sadevakaṃ,

so dharmma-pada(ṃ) sudeśitaṃ

kuśalaḥ puṣam ivaḥ pracesya. Subaṣi 218

⁶⁰. In order to keep the following lines from further slanting this line was kept short on purpose.

⁶¹. The *i*-stroke in *kuśali*- is rubbed off in its upper part to change the vowel to *-o*.

⁶². Nakatani (1984: 146f.) explains why the old reading *vicessati*, as found in the old Thai mss, when softened to *vijessati* led to the elimination of the second stanza in some mss, and to the change from *sekho* to *buddho* in other traditions.

10-4-1

sahaṃsam[o] + + + +

+ + + + + + + +

(70:) eko vayapada ṣeyo _

ya ṣutva uvaśamati ° _ [*6,1 = 85]

sahaṃsam eva vayāṇa °

anathapadasahīṇo _

eko dhamapado [ṣ]e +

+ + + + + [*6,2 = 86]

(71:) sahaṃsam iva gasaṇa _

anathapadasahida _

eko dhamapado ṣeyo _

ya ṣutva uvaśamati _ [*6,3 = 87]

yo sahaṃso sa + + +

+ + + + + + + +

(72:) ega ca jīṇa atvaṇo _

so hu saṃgama utamo ° [*6,4 = 88]

[15 stanzas of the *puṣpavarga completed.]

sahasa bi ya vayāṇa

anātha-pada-sahida,

eka vāya-pada ṣevha

ya ṣutva uvaśamati. Dhp-G^K 306

sahasam api ce vācā

anathapadasaṃhitā,

ekaṃ atthapadaṃ seyyo

yaṃ sutvā upasammati. Dhp 100

sahasram api ye vācā

anathapadasahida

ekaṃ atthapadaṃ

yaṃ śottā upaśāṃmati. Dhp-P 376

sahasram api vācānāṃ

anarthapadasaṃhitā,

ekā arthavatī śreyā

yāṃ śrutvā upaśāmyati. Mvu III 434:13+14

yac ca gāthāsataṃ bhāṣed

adharmapadasaṃhitāṃ,

ekaṃ dharmapadaṃ śreyo

yac chrutvā hy upaśāmyati. Uv 24,2

. hasa bi ya gadhaṇa

anātha-pada-sahida

eka gadha-pada ṣeho

ya ṣutva uvaśamati. Dhp-G^K 308

sahasram api gāthānāṃ

anarthapadasaṃhitā,

ekā arthavatī śreyā

yāṃ śrutvā upaśāmyati. Mvu III 434:15+16

yo sahasa sahasaṇi

sagami maṇuṣa jīṇi

eka ji jīṇi atvaṇa

so ho sagamu utamu. Dhp-G^K 305

yo sahasaṃ sahasena

saṅgāme mānuse jine,

ekaṃ ca jeyya-m-attānaṃ

sa ve saṅgāmajuttamo. Dhp 103

yaḥ sahasraṃ sahasrāṇāṃ

saṃgrāme dviṣatāṃ jayet,

yaś cātmānaṃ jayed ekaṃ

saṃgrāmo durjayaḥ sa vai. Uv 13,3

atva hi saṃjido ṣeyo °
ya caṃña idaro praya _ [*6,5 = 89]

ya ca vaṣa[śa] +
(73:) śpage pariyāṇe vaṇe

egaṃ ca bhavidatvaṇa ____
mahuta vi puyae
sa yeva puyaṇaṃ ṣeyo _____
[*6,6 = 90; end]

yaḥ sahasra sahasrāṇaṃ
(saṃ)grāme mānuṣaṃ jayet,
ekaṇ ca jayam ātmānaṃ
sa vai saṃgrāmajin naraḥ. Subaṣi 298

yo śatāni sahasrāṇaṃ
saṃgrāme manuḥ jaye,
yo caikaṃ jaye ātmānaṃ
sa vai saṃgrāmajit* varaḥ. Mvu III 434: 17f.

attā have jitaṃ seyyo
yā cāyaṃ itarā pajā,
attadantassa posassa
niccaṃ saññatacārino. Dhp 104

āttā hi varaṃ dānto
yacchāyaṃ itarā prajā,
ātmadāntasya puruṣasya
nityaṃ saṃvṛtacāriṇaḥ. Dhp-P 319

ātmā hy asya jitaḥ śreyāṃ
yac ceyaṃ itarāḥ prajāḥ,
ātmadāntasya puruṣasya
nityaṃ saṃvṛtacāriṇaḥ. Uv 23,4

ya ja vaṣa-śada jadu
agi pariyara vaṇi
kṣireṇa sapi-telaṇa ⁶³
diva-ratra atadrido. Dhp-G^K 319

eka ji bhavidatvaṇa
mahuta viva puya'i
sameva puyaṇa ṣevha
ya ji vaṣa-śada hodu. Dhp-G^K 320

yo ca vassasataṃ jantu
aggiṃ paricare vane,
ekaṃ ca bhāvitattānaṃ
muhuttaṃ api pūjaye,
sā yeva pūjanā seyyo
yaṇ ce vassasataṃ hutam. Dhp 107

yac ca varṣasataṃ pūrṇaṃ
agniṃ paricareḥ vane,
yac caikaṃ bhāvitātmānaṃ
muhūrtam api pūjayet,
sā tasya pūjanā śreṣṭhā

⁶³. None of the Chinese translations contains the two additional pādas c) and d) as found in Dhp-G^K; cf. Mizuno 1981: 124f. no. 104.

na tad varṣaśataṃ hutam. Uv 24,16
 yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jantu
 aggiṃ paricare vane
 ekaṃ ca bhavitāttānaṃ
 muhuttaṃ api pūjaye
 sā eva pūjanā śreyo
 yac cha vaśśaśataṃ hutam. Dhp-P 380
 yo ca varṣaśataṃ jīve
 agniparicaram caret,
 patrāhāro chavāvāsī
 karonto vividham tapa,
 yo caikaṃ bhāvitātmānaṃ
 muhūrtam api pūjayet,
 sa ekaṃ pūjanā śreyo
 na ca varṣaśataṃ hutam. Mvu III 435:21-24

Palaeography

The scribe wrote Kharoṣṭhī fluently and in an elegant hand. He must have had a clerical education before he copied these Dhp verses. On the other hand, mistakes, omissions and one interjection (see below), show that copying the Dhp may have been one of the earliest scribal exercises of the clerk in a new monastic ambience. A man joining the order after a phase of extensive writing in the profane world would explain the evidence.

The letters he used already comprise diacritical enhancements, mainly horizontal strokes above or below the base letters, which are meant to indicate slight or significant differences in pronunciation. So far it is unknown when and where these diacritics were introduced. They are not found in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions on rocks or coins before the end of the first century CE. The writer of the Prajñāpāramitā manuscript (Falk & Karashima 2012, 2013) with a radiocarbon date in the later first century CE does not use them.

Over-barred letters, so common in Dhp-G^K, are rare in Dhp-G^S.

ḥa: Over-barred *ḥa* is found in both texts and in most cases represents Skt *dhya*: *asva-jaya* (*asvādhyāya/asajjhāya*) Dhp-G^S 4,1; *buḥati* (*budhyate/bujjhati*) Dhp-G^S 3,15. However, Dhp-G^K shows a number of cases where our text drops the over-bar: *majima* (*madhyama/majjhima*) Dhp-G^S 3,19 vs. *maḥima* Dhp-G^K 146; *ujida* (*ujjhita*) Dhp-G^S 5,6 vs. *uḥida* Dhp-G^K 303. Only once in Dhp-G^K does *ḥa* represent Skt *hya*: *ḍaḥamāṇa* Dhp-G^K 159 vs. *ḍaśamāṇena* (*dahyamāṇa*) in Dhp-G^S 3,9. Dhp-G^K thus treats *hya* as if it was *dhya*, while in Dhp-G^S it appears as *śa*. On the change from *hya* to *śa* and the phonetic similarity between *ḥa* and *śa* cf. Brough 1962: 105 § 61. In all other cases *ḥa* represents Skt *dhya*, P *jjha*. The difference to plain *ja* seems to be slight, as the non-overbarred form is used twice in Dhp-G^S instead. Initial *dhya* in *dhyānaratāḥ/jhānaratāḥ* also appears as plain *janarada* in Dhp-G^S 3,29.

ḥ: The over-bar stroke for *ḥ* is used just once in Dhp-G^S and nowhere in Dhp-G^K. It occurs at the end of line 2 (Dhp-G^S 1,2) in the *śa* of *yaśa* and seems to make clear that

the second *akṣara* is a *śa* with a flat roof and not another *ya*, which can look rather similar. In another case (Dhp-G^S 2,4 *bhadiya*, Dhp-G^K 229 *bhadi'a*) our scribe or his supervisor overwrites an angular *ya* with a decidedly pointed *ya*. That such clarity makes good sense becomes clear where it is missing, as in Dhp-G^S 4,10, where *bhusā* in Pali, Skt *bhr̥śā*, appears to be written as *bhuyo*, a reading which probably arose from an exemplar where *ya* and *śa* looked alike and the more frequent *bhuyo* (*bhūyas*) came easier to mind than had the less frequent *bhr̥śā*.

ñ: The over-barred *ñā*, so frequent in Dhp-G^K, is missing as it represents a sound derived from Skt *ndh*, which is not used in Gandhara proper.

Under-barred letters are few, mainly *ga* in words like *bhagava*. The straight horizontal line is clearly different from the curved postconsonantal sign for *-ra*, but it seems as if a *gra* led to *ga* at times, as we have *ga* at Bajaur and plain *ga* at Khotan: *game* (*grāme*) Dhp-G^S 5,4, *gami* Kh-292; *gamo* (*grāmaṃ*) Dhp-G^S 5,11 vs. *gamu* Kh-294; *saṃgama* (*saṃgrāmaḥ*) Dhp-G^S 6,4 vs. *sagamu* Dhp-G^K 305; *gati* (*gatiṃ*) B-5,10 vs. *gadi* Dhp-G^K 297. In stanza 305 Dhp-G^K shows once *sagamu* and once *sagami* and in one case Dhp-G^K shows the under-bar and Dhp-G^S does not: *saṃgadi* (*saṃgatiḥ*) Dhp-G^S 2,3 vs. *sagadi* Dhp-G^K 228.

In one case *ga* in our text replaces an original *ka*, which is retained in Khotan: *egaśo* (*ekaśas*) Dhp-G^S 3,17 vs. *ekada* Dhp-G^K 152. In two cases *ga* in our text corresponds to a dropped velar in Dhp-G^K: *bhoga* (*bhoga-*) Dhp-G^S 1,2 vs. *bho'a-* Dhp-G^K 323; *saṃkaraguḍasvi* (*saṃskārakūṭe*) Dhp-G^S 5,6 vs. *sagara-'uḍasa* Dhp-G^K 303.

śa The under-barred regular *śa* is frequent in Bajaur and is used for a fricative derived from the aspirates *dha* or *tha*. In cases where both texts are preserved, Dhp-G^K retains the aspirated dental: *yatha* Dhp-G^K 290 vs. *yaśa* (*yathā*) Dhp-G^S 5,1+6; *yadha* Dhp-G^K 303; *meṣavo* (*medhāvī*) Dhp-G^S 1,6; *vaśido* (*vyādhito*) Dhp-G^S 3,5; *bhośa* (*bhavatha*) Dhp-G^S 4,3.

For the same fricative also a non-underbarred *sa* may be written: *yasa* (*yathā*) Dhp-G^S 5,2, 3,18 vs. *yatha* Dhp-G^K 291; *yadha* Dhp-G^K 147; *pase* (*pathe*) Dhp-G^S 5,6 vs. *pathe* Dhp-G^K 303; *tasa++* (*tathāgata*) Dhp-G^S 2,11 vs. *tadhakada* Dhp-G^K 267; *asa* (*atha*) Dhp-G^S 3,2 vs. *adha* Dhp-G^K-160; *prusujana* (*prthagjana*) Dhp-G^S-5,7 vs. *prudhijane* Dhp-G^K-304; *gasana* (*gāthānāṃ*) Dhp-G^S 6,3 vs. *gadhaṇa+gadha* Dhp-K 308.

The “modern” wavy *śa*, used throughout Dhp-G^K instead of *sa* (not for *si*, *se*, *so*, *su*!), is not found anywhere in Dhp-G^S.

ḍa: The *ḍa* does have a rather regular under-bar, but this only helps to distinguish the character from the very similar *ja*.

ṇa/na: Our scribe usually does not distinguish between dental *ṇa* and cerebral *ṇa*. The form he uses is a straight vertical with a round head to the upper right, a direct descendant of the traditional *ṇa*. However, in a few cases, as in stanza 5,12b, end of line 65, we see both forms when reading *vasitamanasa ṇara*. The *na* is wavy and the *ṇa* is straight. For Khotan, Konow (1914: 87) found the rule, that *ṇa* is used commonly, and *na* only at the beginning of a word or where Sanskrit would have *nnā* or *nda*. Here, in this singular case, we can only state that the position at the beginning or inside a word makes the

difference, although the use of both nasals with regard to the beginning of a word is just the opposite.

All paleaographical features taken together speak for a date in the late first century CE or shortly later.

The writing process

Our ms is not simply the result of copying an older one. It shows clearly that several people were engaged in its production. This conclusion arises from several observations, one of which is most exceptional: After the second verse (1,2) we read *io* (wiped out: *ajihi*) *anutridiya ajihiṃ katava*, which probably means “here, i.e. following the third, i.e. from the third verse onwards, it has to be made straight”. For **anutrīyaṃ* parallels are scarce. One is *cānudaśamaṃ* in Vasiṣṭhasmṛti 17,43, which is translated by G. Bühler⁶⁴ as “and a tithe”, modernized by P. Olivelle⁶⁵ to “and one tenth”. The rule regulates the distribution of cows and horses among inheriting brothers. Rule 17,42 allots to the eldest brother two animals in every distribution cycle while his brothers take only one. In the following rule I read (with mss C, Bh and H) *vānudaśamaṃ*, which means not “and one tenth in addition”, but “optionally following the tenth (animal)”, that is “from the tenth animal onwards”. After all brothers received at least 10 cows and horses, if their father bequeathed that many, the oldest son may optionally take two every time his brothers get one of the remaining animals. This gives the later-born brothers the chance to run their own farm on a sufficient basis and strengthens the oldest at the same time.⁶⁶

The second questionable term is *ajihiṃ*, Skt *ajihma*, which denotes something or someone not crooked, not bent or not twisted. With regard to scriptures the order seems to say that the text should be straightened, deprived of its crookedness. How did the text look in its crooked, “unstraightened” form? Telling from a number of mistakes it seems that an exemplar had to be copied which was missing some parts of its material and which may have been difficult to decipher in places. Particularly around the verses 3,22-24 the copyist was at a loss and certainly not in a position to emend the text. Also the abrupt end does not give the impression of an orderly closure.

This leads me to the thesis that this single sheet with verses from a Dhp is the result of a writing and emendation exercise, building on a older exemplar, written by a basically experienced writer, who may have been newly introduced to Buddhist poetry, made to use a common and not really sacrosanct text for the exercise. Without doubt, the order to do better was not written by the overall writer but by his supervisor.

Acknowledgment

While looking for parallels help was received from Klaus Wille. An invitation to Soka University at Hachioji in spring 2012 made it possible to re-inspect the manuscript with Seishi Karashima and Tatsushi Tamai, which led to a number of improvements and

⁶⁴ Georg Bühler, *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas*, part II (Sacred Books of the East, 14). Oxford 1882: 88.

⁶⁵ Patrick Olivelle, *Dharmasūtras*. Delhi 2000: 419.

⁶⁶ This interpretation of *anu-* plus ordinal number may also apply to *anumadhyama*, “following the middle (aged) one”, as found in the Kāśikāvṛtti on Pāṇini 6.2,189.

clarifications. Working with Chinese and Japanese sources and secondary literature was greatly facilitated with their help. The owners allowed to work leisurely on their manuscripts maintaining their usual generosity and equanimity. Blair Silverlock made the English comprehensible. To all of them I am deeply beholden.

References and abbreviations

- Analayo
2009 The development of the Pāli *Udāna* collection. *Buddhist Studies / Bukkyō Kenkyū* 37: 39-72.
- Baums, Stefan
2009 *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses – British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*. Dissertation University of Washington.
- Bernhard, Franz
1965 *Udānavarga. Band I: Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie* (Abhandlungen, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 54). Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
1968 *Udānavarga. Band II: Indices, Konkordanzen, Synoptische Tabellen* (Abhandlungen, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 54). Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Boucher, Daniel
2005 Review of Mark Allon, Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 48: 289-295.
- Brough, John
1962 *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada* (London Oriental Series, 7). London.
- Caillat, Colette
1978 Form of the future in the Gāndhārī Dharmapada. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute - Diamond Jubilee Volume*: 101-106.
- Cone, Margaret
1989 Patna Dharmapada, Part I: Text. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13: 101-217.
- Cox, Collett
2009 [2013] What's in a name? School affiliation in an early Buddhist Gāndhārī manuscript. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* (Essays in Honor of Richard Salomon's 65th Birthday) 23: 53-63.
- CPS = *Catuspariṣatsūtra*. cf. Waldschmidt
- Dhammajoti
2009 *Fa Ju Jing*, the oldest Chinese version of the Dharmapada: Some remarks on the language and sect-affiliation. *Buddhist Studies - Bukkyō Kenkū* 37: 1-38.
- Dhp = (Pali) Dharmapada, cf. von Hinüber & Norman
- Falk, Harry
2009 The name of Vema Takhtu. Werner Sundermann, Almut Hintze & François de Blois (eds.), *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams* (Iranica, 17). Wiesbaden (Harrassowitz): 105-116.
2011 The 'Split Collection' of Kharoṣṭhī texts. *ARIRIAB* 14: 13-23.
- Falk, Harry & Seishi Karashima
2012 A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 1 (Texts from the Split Collection, 1). *ARIRIAB* 15: 19-61.
2013 A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 5 (Texts from the Split Collection, 2). *ARIRIAB* 16: 97-169.
- Falk, Harry & Ingo Strauch
2014 The Bajaur and Split Collections of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts within the context of Buddhist Gāndhārī literature. Paul Harrison & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Denkschriften, 460 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 80). Wien (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften): 51-78.
- Faucett, Lawrence W.
1968 *The Essence of Northern Buddhism in the Earliest Chinese Dhammapada (c. 244 A.D.)*. San Marcos.
- Hara, Minoru
1992 A Note on Dharmapada 97. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35: 179-191.

von Hinüber, Oskar & K.R. Norman

1994 *Dhammapada*. Oxford (The Pali Text Society).

It = Itivuttaka

1975 Ernst Windisch (ed.), *Iti-Vuttaka* (Text Series, 39). London/Boston (Pali Text Society).

Karashima, Seishi with Oskar von Hinüber

2012 *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ – Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins* (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, 13). Tokyo (Soka University).

Konow, Sten

1914 Bemerkungen über die Kharoṣṭhī-Handschrift des Dhammapada. *Festschrift Ernst Windisch*. Leipzig (Harrassowitz): 85-97.

Lenz, Timothy

2003 *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories. British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25* (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, 3). Seattle/ London (University of Washington Press).

Lévi, Sylvain

1912 L'apramāda-varga. étude sur les recensions des Dharmapadas. Documents de l'Asie Centrale, Mission Pelliot. *Journal Asiatique* 10^e sér. 20: 203-294.

Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元

1979 *Dharmapadas of various Buddhist schools. Studies in Pali and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honour of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*. Delhi (B.R. Publishing): 255-267.

1981 *Hokkukyō no Kenkyū* (法句經の研究) [A Study of the Dharmapada], Tokyo (Shunjūsha).

1984 A comparative study of Dharmapadas. Gatara Dhammapala, Richard Gombrich & K.R. Norman (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa*. Nugegoda (University of Sri Jayewardenepura): 168-175.

Nakatani, Hideaki

1984 Remarques sur la transmission des Dharmapada. *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 2: 135-151.

1987 *Udānavarga de Subaṣi. Edition critique du manuscrit Sanskrit sur bois provenant de Subaṣi* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 53). Paris (Collège de France).

Namikawa, Takayoshi

1993 The transmission of the new material Dharmapada and the sect to which it belonged. *Buddhist Studies – Bukkyō Kenkyū* 22: 151-166.

Norman, K.R.

1997 *The World of the Doctrine (Dhammapada), translated with an introduction and notes* (Pali Text Society Translation Series, 46). Oxford (Pali Text Society).

Schmithausen, Lambert

1970 Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 14: 47-124.

Skilling, Peter

1997a On the School-affiliation of the "Patna Dhammapada". *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 23: 83-122.

1997b Citations from the scriptures of the "eighteen schools" in the Tarkajvālā. Kieffer-Pülz, Petra & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākarah - Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Indica et Tibetica, 30). Swisttal-Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 605-614.

SN = Saṃyuttanikāya (1973/1998)

1973 Léon Feer (ed.), *Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka, I: Sagādhā-vagga*. London/Boston (Pali Text Society).

1998 G.A. Somaratne, *Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka, I: Sagādhā-vagga. A Critical Apparatus*. Oxford (Pali Text Society).

ThG = Theragāthā

1966 Hermann Oldenberg & Richard Pischel (eds.), *The Thera- and Therî-Gāthā: (Stanzas ascribed to elders of the Buddhist order of recluses.)* 2nd ed. with appendices by K.R. Norman & L. Alsdorf. London (Pali Text Society).

ThīG = Therīgāthā cf. ThG

Uv cf. Bernhard 1965.

Vin = Vinayapīṭaka

1879 Hermann Oldenberg (ed.), *The Vinaya Piṭakam I: The Mahāvagga*. London, repr. 1969 (Pali Text Society).

1880 Hermann Oldenberg (ed.), *The Vinaya Piṭakam II: The Cullavagga*. London, repr. 1977 (Pali Text Society).

Waldschmidt, Ernst

- 1956 *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra. Teil II: Textbearbeitung: Vorgang 1-21* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1956,1). Berlin (Akademie-Verlag): 69-217.
- 1962 *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra. Teil III: Textbearbeitung: Vorgang 22-28.* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1960,1). Berlin (Akademie-Verlag): 221-461.

Willemen, Charles

- 1973 The prefaces to the Chinese Dharmapadas Fa-Chü Ching and Ch'u-Yao Ching. *T'oung Pao* 59: 203-219.
- 1974 *Dharmapada – A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dhammapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature* (Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques, Série “Études et Textes”, 3). Bruxelles.
- 1978 *The Chinese Udānavarga – A Collection of Important Odes of the Law Fa Chi Yao Sung Ching* (Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, 19). Bruxelles (Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises).

Yamazaki, Moriichi 山崎守一

- 2000 “Dhammapada heikō shikyaku taishōhyō 平行詩脚対照表 [Parallel Pādas to the Dhammapada]”. Kōyasan Daigaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūshitsu (ed.), *Takagi Shingen Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronshū Bukkyō Bunka no Shosō* 高木神元博士古稀記念論集：仏教文化の諸相 [Buddhist Studies in Honour of Professor Shingen Takagi on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday: Many Aspects of Buddhist Culture]. Tokyo (Sankibō Busshorin): 203–236.

Fig. 1. Lines 1 to 33 of the *Dharmapada*, Split Collection.

PLATE 5

Fig. 2. Lines 28 to 59 of the *Dharmapada*, Split Collection.

Fig. 3. Lines 55 to 73 of the *Dharmapada*, Split Collection.